

# BRILL'S STUDIES IN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

*General Editor*

A.J. VANDERJAGT, University of Groningen

*Editorial Board*

M. COLISH, Oberlin College

J.I. ISRAEL, University College, London

J.D. NORTH, University of Groningen

H.A. OBERMAN, University of Arizona, Tucson

R.H. POPKIN, Washington University, St. Louis-UCLA

VOLUME 61



# CENTRES OF LEARNING

*Learning and Location  
in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*

EDITED BY

JAN WILLEM DRIJVERS

AND

ALASDAIR A. MACDONALD



E.J. BRILL  
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN  
1995



The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

### **Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Centres of learning : learning and location in pre-modern Europe and the Near East / edited by J.W. Drijvers and A.A. MacDonald

p. cm. — (Brill's studies in intellectual history, ISSN 0920-8607 ; v. 61)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 9004101934 (cloth)

1. Education, Ancient—Europe—History. 2. Education, Ancient—Middle East—History. 3. Education, Medieval—Europe—History. 4. Education, Medieval—Middle East—History. 5. Learning and scholarship—History—Medieval, 500-1500. 6. Islamic learning and Scholarship—History. 7. Schools—Europe—History. 8. Schools—Middle East—History. I. Drijvers, Jan Willem. II. MacDonald, A. A. (Alasdair A.) III. Series.

LA31.C46 1995

370'.93—dc20

94-46806

CIP

### **Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme**

**Centres of learning** : learning and location in pre-modern Europe and the Near East / ed. by J. W. Drijvers and A. A. MacDonald. - Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1995

(Brill's studies in intellectual history ; Vol. 61)

ISBN 90-04-10193-4

NE: Drijvers, Jan Willem [Hrsg.]; GT

ISSN 0920-8607

ISBN 90 04 10193 4

© Copyright 1995 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.  
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

## CONTENTS

|                             |      |
|-----------------------------|------|
| Acknowledgements .....      | VII  |
| Notes on Contributors ..... | IX   |
| Abbreviations .....         | XI   |
| Preface .....               | XIII |

### FROM AN ANTIQUE LAND

|                                                                                 |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| H.L.J. Vanstiphout                                                              |    |
| On the Old Babylonian Eduba Curriculum .....                                    | 3  |
| M.E. Vogelzang                                                                  |    |
| Learning and Power during the Sargonid Period .....                             | 17 |
| Jan N. Bremmer                                                                  |    |
| The Family and Other Centres of Religious Learning in<br>Antiquity .....        | 29 |
| Roelof van den Broek                                                            |    |
| The Christian 'School' of Alexandria in the Second and<br>Third Centuries ..... | 39 |
| Han J.W. Drijvers                                                               |    |
| The School of Edessa: Greek Learning and Local Culture ...                      | 49 |

### EX ORIENTE LUX

|                                                                                                                        |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| John W. Watt                                                                                                           |     |
| Eastward and Westward Transmission of Classical Rhetoric                                                               | 63  |
| G.J. Reinink                                                                                                           |     |
| 'Edessa grew dim and Nisibis shone forth': The School of<br>Nisibis at the Transition of the Sixth-Seventh Century ... | 77  |
| Fred Leemhuis                                                                                                          |     |
| The Koran and its Exegesis: from Memorising to Learning                                                                | 91  |
| Geert Jan van Gelder                                                                                                   |     |
| Arabic Didactic Verse .....                                                                                            | 103 |
| Wolfhart Heinrichs                                                                                                     |     |
| The Classification of the Sciences and the Consolidation of<br>Philology in Classical Islam .....                      | 119 |
| George Makdisi                                                                                                         |     |
| Baghdad, Bologna, and Scholasticism .....                                                                              | 141 |

## CLOISTERS AND SCHOOLS

- Mayke de Jong  
 Old Law and New-Found Power: Hrabanus Maurus and the  
 Old Testament ..... 161
- Jan W.M. van Zwieten  
 Scientific and Spiritual Culture in Hugh of St Victor .... 177
- F.A. van Liere  
 Andrew of St Victor (d.1175): Scholar between Cloister and  
 School ..... 187
- I. van 't Spijker  
 Learning by Experience: Twelfth-Century Monastic Ideas 197
- Marcia L. Colish  
 The Development of Lombardian Theology, 1160-1215 ... 207
- J.M.M.H. Thijssen  
 Academic Heresy and Intellectual Freedom at the University  
 of Paris, 1200-1378 ..... 217
- Dick E.H. de Boer  
 Ludwig the Bavarian and the Scholars ..... 229
- Anneke B. Mulder-Bakker  
 The Recluserium as an Informal Centre of Learning .... 245
- Peter Binkley  
 John Bromyard and the Hereford Dominicans ..... 255

## EXPANDING HORIZONS

- A.J. Vanderjagt  
 Classical Learning and the Building of Power at the Fif-  
 teenth-Century Burgundian Court ..... 267
- Anne Marie De Gendt  
*Aucuns Petis Enseignemens*: 'Home-made' Courtesy Books in  
 Medieval France ..... 279
- A.A. MacDonald  
 The Renaissance Household as Centre of Learning ..... 289
- Theo van Heijnsbergen  
 The Scottish Chapel Royal as Cultural Intermediary be-  
 tween Town and Court ..... 299
- Catrien Santing  
 'Liberation from the Trivial Yoke': Dutch Renaissance Edu-  
 cators and their Cultural and Socio-Political Objectives 315
- F. Akkerman:  
 Latin Literature in Early Modern Groningen ..... 329

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editors wish to record their gratitude to the following: The Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences (KNAW), the Board of Governors ('College van Bestuur') of the University of Groningen, the Faculty of Arts of the University of Groningen, Groningen University Fund (GUF) and the organisers of the 'Centres of Learning' conference (Dr. W.J. van Bekkum, Dr. P.A. Binkley, Dr. Jos.M.M. Hermans, Prof. S.L. Radt, Dr. C.G. Santing). Special thanks to Marij Becking, Norrie Horlings-Brandse and Justa Renner-van Niekerk for their technical and secretarial assistance. The 'Centres of Learning' conference is the first of two conferences to be held as part of the Encyclopaedia Project of the COMERS Research Centre; this project is supported by a subsidy from the Central Policy Reserves ('Centrale Beleidsruimte') of the University of Groningen.



## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Fokke Akkerman is Senior Lecturer in Latin, University of Groningen

Peter Binkley is Research Fellow in Medieval Studies, University of Groningen

Dick de Boer is Professor of Medieval History, University of Groningen

Jan Bremmer is Professor of History of Religion, University of Groningen

Roelof van den Broek is Professor of History of Christianity, University of Utrecht

Marcia Colish is Professor of the History of Philosophy, Oberlin College

Han Drijvers is Professor of Semitic Languages, University of Groningen

Jan Willem Drijvers is Lecturer in Ancient History, University of Groningen

Geert Jan van Gelder is Lecturer in Arabic, University of Groningen

Anne Marie De Gendt is Lecturer in Medieval French, University of Groningen

Theo van Heijnsbergen is Lecturer in Scottish Literature, University of Glasgow

Wolfhart Heinrichs is Professor at the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University

Mayke de Jong is Professor of Medieval History, University of Utrecht

Fred Leemhuis is Senior Lecturer in Arabic, University of Groningen

Frans van Liere is Junior Research Fellow in Medieval Studies, University of Groningen

Alasdair MacDonald is Professor of Medieval English Language and Literature, University of Groningen

George Makdisi is Professor of the History of Islam, University of Pennsylvania

Anneke Mulder-Bakker is Lecturer in Medieval History, University of Groningen

Gerrit Reinink is Senior Lecturer in Syriac, University of Groningen

Catrien Santing is Lecturer in Medieval History, University of Groningen

Ineke van 't Spijker is Lecturer in Medieval History, University of Groningen

Hans Thijssen is Lecturer in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy, Catholic University of Nijmegen

Arjo Vanderjagt is Professor of the History of Ideas, University of Groningen

Herman Vanstiphout is Senior Lecturer in Assyriology, University of Groningen

Marianne Vogelzang is Research Fellow in Assyriology, University of Groningen

John Watt is Senior Lecturer in Syriac, University of Wales, Cardiff

Jan van Zwieten has a doctorate in Medieval History, University of Amsterdam

## ABBREVIATIONS

- AASS—Acta Sanctorum  
AHDLM—*Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*  
ANRW—*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. H. Temporini  
(Berlin 1972- )  
AS—*Assyriological Studies*  
BSOAS—*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*  
CCCM—Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis  
CIMAGEL—*Cahiers de l'Institut de moyen-âge grec et latin*, Université de  
Copenhagen  
CRAI—*Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-  
Lettres*  
CSCO—Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium  
DThC—*Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*  
EETS—Early English Text Society  
JCS—*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*  
JEH—*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*  
JAOS—*Journal of the American Oriental Society*  
JSS—*Journal of Semitic Studies*  
MGH Epp.—*Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae*  
MGH SS—*Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*  
NK—W. Nijhoff, M.E. Kronenberg, *Nederlandsche Bibliographie van  
1500 tot 1540* (The Hague 1923-1966)  
OrChr—*Oriens Christianus*  
OrChrA—*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*  
PG—*Patrologia Graeca* (ed. J.P. Migne)  
PL—*Patrologia Latina* (ed. J.P. Migne)  
PO—*Patrologia Orientalis* (ed. R. Graffin et al.)  
RAC—*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (ed. T. Klauser et al.)  
RE—*Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (ed. A. Pauly,  
G. Wissowa et al.)  
SAA—State Archives of Assyria (Helsinki University Press)  
SC—*Sources Chrétiennes*  
STS—Scottish Text Society  
TRE—*Theologische Realenzyklopaedie* (ed. G. Krause, G. Müller)  
ZDMG—*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*





## PREFACE

In 1993 the Faculty of Arts of the University of Groningen, The Netherlands, took the decision to raise to the level of a Research Institute what had previously been the Centre for Classical, Oriental, Medieval and Renaissance Studies (COMERS). The particular aim of this Institute is: to apply a diachronic and comparative approach to the study of the great tradition of European culture, and the roots thereof, in pre-modern times. It is the belief of the COMERS researchers that the study of cultural history can best be prosecuted in a broad, integrated and interdisciplinary way. In accordance with this, the object of research of those associated with COMERS has been formulated as 'knowledge and the transmission of knowledge, from ancient times through to the Renaissance, in both East and West'.

To mark the establishment of COMERS as Research Institute an international conference was organised, on the theme of 'centres of learning'. Some forty scholars gave papers in this conference; the majority came, as was natural, from Groningen itself, but the conference was also graced by contributions from several scholars from other universities in The Netherlands as well as from abroad. The present volume contains a selection of the papers presented at the conference. The historical sweep and the geographical range of the subjects tackled testify to the deliberate intentions of COMERS.

Although there is thus no small variety in the matters treated in the following pages, it is the hope of the editors that the central topic of 'centres of learning' will nonetheless impart to this volume a real measure of thematic coherence. Knowledge implies a combination of human and material resources within a particular social context, and the transmission of knowledge presupposes a social and intellectual dynamic, which reflects, formally or informally, a particular institutional or religious environment. In this perspective, the concept of 'centres of learning' should be interpreted in a rather broad sense, in order to make allowance for many different kinds of centre and for many different kinds of learning. The basic assumption nevertheless remains, that there is an influence—probably a mutual one—between learning and location. The subjects studied in centres of learning inevitably change as the times change, but the role of the

centre of learning itself within the learning process exhibits a surprising consistency.

The contributions published in this book have been grouped into four large sections, each designated by a general heading. These have been presented here in chronological sequence. Within each of these four sections the papers have been further assorted on the basis of their mutual affinities. It will, however, be evident that there are overlappings of theme between different groups. The editors recognise, and indeed welcome, this fact, since it serves to underscore the fundamental continuities and modalities which, they believe, pertain to 'centres of learning' as such.

J.W. Drijvers, A.A. MacDonald  
July 1994

FROM AN ANTIQUE LAND



## ON THE OLD BABYLONIAN EDUBA CURRICULUM

H.L.J. VANSTIPHOUT

*A scribe who does not know Sumerian—what manner of scribe is he?*  
(Sumerian ‘proverb’; ab. 1900 BCE)

When Baghdad flowered as one of the main centres of literature, learning, and scholarship in early medieval times,<sup>1</sup> this was actually the second time around. About three millennia earlier the cities in the neighbourhood of Baghdad and to the south had developed a system of learning, literature, and other intellectual pursuits which was original in an absolute sense, and even more exclusive and in the long run perhaps more enduring than the Abbasids’ seminal achievement. Since we have known this for little more than a century, the implications are not easy to perceive immediately. The present contribution will be restricted to an evaluation of the structure and the intentions of the Old Babylonian *Eduba*<sup>2</sup> curriculum—or, if one prefers, the system of education, learning, and literacy—in Mesopotamia.

A quaint fact is to be noted at the outset: while Babylonia proper, or central and southern Mesopotamia, was of *primary* international political importance only during three or four relatively short periods—out of a possible twenty-five, less than six centuries all told<sup>3</sup>—during the long and chequered history of Mesopotamia, its cultural pre-eminence was all-pervading during the three millennia we traditionally use as the time-bracket of Ancient Near Eastern civilization. We should bear in mind, for instance, that when the eighteenth dynasty of Egypt ruled the East in the latter half of the

---

<sup>1</sup> See the contribution by Prof. George Makdisi to this volume.

<sup>2</sup> The Sumerian term literally means “Tablet House”, and stands for school, library and scriptorium at the same time. One should bear in mind that the Old Babylonian period is (rightfully) singled out for the sheer wealth of material it has to offer and because it represents the highest flowering of the system—but the system as such can be easily traced back to the third quarter of the third millennium.

<sup>3</sup> The Agade period in its heyday (ab. 2330 to 2220), the Old Babylonian reign of Hammurabi’s dynasty (ab. 1790-1590), the time of Nebuchadnezzar I (ab. 1125-1050) and finally the shortlived Chaldean period (625-539).

second millennium, they did so by means of Babylonian cuneiform, while Babylonia itself was a weak and puny state beset by no less than three mighty neighbours. But all of them used the same cuneiform writing for their own languages, and also for Babylonian Akkadian, which was accepted as the international language, and even for learned Sumerian.<sup>4</sup> How did this come about?

When true writing originated for the first time<sup>5</sup> in the Ancient Near East—to be precise, in southern Iraq in the last centuries of the fourth millennium BCE as an invention of *homo literatus sumericus Urukæus*<sup>6</sup>—, it naturally gave rise to a system of training in writing, as is witnessed by the immediate and far-flung spread of writing and by the tablets themselves, countless because they are virtually indestructible even by fire.

At some point in time, certainly by the third quarter of the third millennium, this system of training was generalised and institutionalised into what has long since been recognised as the *Eduba*, which literally means Tablet House, and stands for Library as well as School. Our knowledge of this *Eduba* system is based primarily upon the mainly Old Babylonian finds in the cities of Nippur, Ur, Sippar and Kish. The bulk of the tablets found there is at present housed in Philadelphia, Istanbul, Baghdad, and London. The different find spots nevertheless deliver the same material. Precisely how they arrived at, and maintained, this uniformity remains unknown. But the uniformity in distribution, format and contents evinced by the bulk of the tablets has allowed us to reconstruct the *Eduba* system in some detail.<sup>7</sup> And we know that Shulgi, the greatest king of the

---

<sup>4</sup> The other languages using Babylonian cuneiform at that period are: Hittite, Luvian, Hattian, Hurrian, Elamite, Ugaritic, Early North West Semitic and possibly a few ‘unknowns’ as well.

<sup>5</sup> I.J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing* (Chicago 1952) is still the most outspoken defence of the Mesopotamian monogenesis of writing. Modern thinking and analysis is veering more in the direction of polygenesis among the great riverine urban civilizations. The fact remains, however, that Sumerian cuneiform was undoubtedly the first in an absolute sense.

<sup>6</sup> The felicitous term was coined by M.E. Powell, “Three Problems in the History of Cuneiform Writing: Origins, Direction of Script, Literacy”, *Visible Language* 15 (1981) 419-440.

<sup>7</sup> Good overviews and/or analyses are: A. Falkenstein, “Die babylonische Schule”, *Saeculum* 4 (1953) 125-137; C.J. Gadd, *Teachers and Students in the Oldest Schools* (London 1956); idem, “Fragments of Assyrian Scholastic Literature”, *BSOAS* 20 (1957) 255-265; S.N. Kramer, “Die sumerische Schule”, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität zu Jena* 5 (1956) 695-700; W.H.Ph. Römer,

Third Dynasty of Ur (roughly 2100-2000 BCE) “founded” or re-founded the two major “Schools” or “Academies”—one in Nippur, and one in Ur. At this point a general description of the Eduba curriculum seems desirable.

I. The language and the subject of instruction is Sumerian, a language which in Old Babylonian times, when the great flowering of the academies took place, was no longer spoken. Of course, it derived its special stature from the fact that, after all, it was the basis of the writing system. The Mesopotamians never made any difficulty about this: in one of their great epics it is stated quite openly that the great boon of Mesopotamia to mankind in general, and to obstreperous foreign princelings in particular, is the spread of Sumerian and thus of cuneiform writing.<sup>8</sup> This suggests a manifest sense of destiny, and it was the first one to be put in writing. To learn to write is to learn *Sumerian*, which means Sumerian script, Sumerian

---

*Iets over School en Schoolonderricht in het Oude Mesopotamië* (Assen 1977); Å.W. Sjöberg, “The Old Babylonian Eduba”, *AS* 20 (1976) 159-179; H. Vanstiphout, “How did they learn Sumerian?”, *JCS* 31 (1979) 118-126; H. Waetzoldt, “Keilschrift und Schulen in Mesopotamien und Ebla”, *Schriftenreihe zum Bayerischen Schulmuseum Ichenhausen* 4 (1986) 36-50; idem, “Die Entwicklung der Naturwissenschaften und des naturwissenschaftlichen Unterrichts in Mesopotamien”, *Schriftenreihe zum Bayerischen Schulmuseum Ichenhausen* 7 (1988) 31-49; idem, “Der Schreiber als Lehrer in Mesopotamien”, *Schriftenreihe zum Bayerischen Schulmuseum Ichenhausen* 8 (1989) 33-50. Apart from the plethora of teaching manuals, exercise texts and references to school life, there are fascinating documents from daily practice and/or from reflection on the scribal education; see e.g. Å.W. Sjöberg, “In Praise of Scribal Art”, *JCS* 24 (1972) 126-131; idem, “Der Examenstext A”, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 64 (1975) 137-176; and now idem, “CBS 11319 +. An Old Babylonian Schooltext from Nippur”, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 83 (1993) 1-21. See also M. Civil, “Sur les ‘livres d’écolier’ à l’époque paléobabylonienne”, in J.-M. Durand et al. (eds.), *Miscellanea Babyoniaca. Mélanges offerts à Maurice Birot* (Paris 1985) 67-78.

<sup>8</sup> This is a famous passage in the epic tale about Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta. See G. Komoróczy, “Zur Ätiologie der Schrifterfindung im Enmerkar-Epos”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 3 (1975) 19-24; H. Vanstiphout, “Enmerkar’s Invention of Writing Revisited”, in: H. Behrens et al. (eds.), *DUMU-E<sub>2</sub>-DUB-BA-A. Studies in Honor of Å. W. Sjöberg* (Philadelphia 1989) 515-524. The story tells us how lord Enmerkar of Uruk invented writing (cuneiform on a clay tablet) when his messenger complained that the message he had to carry to faraway Aratta was too long and too difficult. When the messenger arrives in Aratta he presents the tablet to the ruler of Aratta. This ruler is flustered and despondent when he sees the tablet: for even with the help of a brazier he sees “only nails where he had expected words”. Two lessons may be drawn from this: (1) the Sumerians not only invented cuneiform; they even invented the *term* cuneiform; (2) one’s opponent can be thrown into utter confusion by his not knowing cuneiform.



grammar, Sumerian vocabulary, and Sumerian literature. This goal is achieved by sundry methods. First comes the technical stage, in which the best and clearest way of impressing signs on the wet clay is mastered; at this period only three basic strokes need to be learned: verticals, horizontals, and obliques. Then comes the learning of *signs* proper; these are composed of these basic strokes, and ordered into severely practical sign lists: our modern handbooks of cuneiform follow the ancient sign lists to a large extent. At the same time the linguistic value of the signs is taught. Since this linguistic value can be morphemic or semantic, this gives rise to the drawing up of long lists of signs to be mastered either purely as representations of phonemes or morphemes, or as representations of *words*.<sup>9</sup> But soon the awkward subject of the totally strange Sumerian grammar had to be tackled. There are lists for this as well. The famous *Grammatical Lists* give ordered paradigms of nominal and verbal declension in the two languages: the spoken Semitic *Akkadian*, and the dead *Sumerian*. But they also show in an explicit manner the structural differences between those languages.<sup>10</sup> Odd though it may seem to us, the Mesopotamians of the late third and early second millennium learned to write their own language, which was Akkadian, through the medium of a dead language, Sumerian. But, nineteenth-century philology being a thing of the past, we now know that one cannot really learn a language either from paradigms or—even worse—from *manuels de conversation*. So the instruction in “real” Sumerian was done by means of relatively simple literary or poetic texts, sometimes manifestly constructed for this purpose. During this first stage also the rudiments of counting, accounting, measurement and the like were taught, since these are naturally based upon the same sign system.

II. In a second stage, which is now thought to have been the final stage for most pupils, longer pieces of text were to be written out in a purely imitative way. But exercises in the composition of good Sumerian sentences were also deemed necessary. The construction of typical sentences, and also of typical documents or formats, now

---

<sup>9</sup> For an excellent overview, see M. Civil, “Lexicography”, *AS* 20 (Chicago 1976) 123-157.

<sup>10</sup> There is now a splendid study of these lists: J. Black, *Sumerian Grammar in Babylonian Theory* (Rome 1984).

becomes part of the training in Sumerian: thus the drawing up of administrative documents, with their variations depending upon the branch of administration, is inculcated. In fact, among the many thousands of administrative documents it is sometimes hard to distinguish between a 'real' document and a model; there are a number of null states or empty schedules, just as there are undoubted models and totally fanciful 'complete documents'. Still, the bureaucratic documentation is perfectionist, all-pervading and altogether daunting in its mass. The famous regulation of the Indian Civil Service by which administrative documents older than thirty years could be destroyed providing copies were made in triplicate, has a long and honourable history indeed. Furthermore, instruction was given in "hard science" in the form of relatively advanced mathematics, mostly concerning measurement and calculus. On the side of application, "practical" rule-books about the running—not actually the *performing*—of agricultural, pastoral, and industrial activities were taught,<sup>11</sup> as were principles of the practice of trade and law, and of letter-writing in both the personal and the official spheres. Official 'historical'<sup>12</sup> inscriptions by famous kings were also copied and studied, no doubt as a kind of training in formulating a correct inscription. Lastly, singing and music belonged to the general curriculum. But apart from all this, there still remained the major part of the obligatory training, which consisted of the classical lexical lists, and of the major literary texts.

III. The staple of instruction therefore consisted of (a) the lists, and (b) the literary texts, and it is highly probable that this sequence is

---

<sup>11</sup> Thus what was being taught is actually, at least for the work on the land, agronomy, not agriculture. Since 'industry' had not moved very much beyond craftsmanship, the relevant texts really still relate to skill, craft and art. Bureaucratic though they were, the Mesopotamians did not stoop to 'management'.

<sup>12</sup> School collections of the inscriptions of the kings of the Agade period and of the great King Shulgi of the Third Dynasty of Ur were well known; there are even learned and tabulated descriptions of ancient monumental documents with quotations of the text; see G. Buccellati, "Through a Tablet Darkly. A Reconstruction of Old Akkadian Monuments described in Old Babylonian copies", in: M. Cohen et al. (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll* (Bethesda 1993) 58-71. This tends to prove that 'real' historical inscriptions were copied and studied long after the appropriate event. Yet it can also be shown in a number of cases that the inscriptions are fictional. This is not the same as saying that they are frauds—although there may well have been a number of those as well—but that the text format had become a genre of writing and a subject of study in its own right.

chronological as well, although there are very clear indications that the two educational genres influenced each other.<sup>13</sup> As to the great literary texts, it has become clear in recent years that this field of study involves correct copying—implying, of course, textual criticism in its higher and lower forms<sup>14</sup>—, but also the study of poetic language (including imagery) and structure, and therefore also interpretation.<sup>15</sup> Even more exciting is the fairly recent insight that the study of *music* was intimately linked to the study of literature; this is of course highly relevant for our view of the performance of the higher literature.<sup>16</sup>

IV. While much remains to be done, recent work by Hartmut Waetzoldt<sup>17</sup> has begun to tie up what we know from the schools

<sup>13</sup> In the Enmerkar story mentioned above in note 8, there occurs a list of dogs of different colours; the identical list is found in the 'Animal' section of the great quasi-encyclopaedic word list. On the other hand, the lists are often 'adorned' with expressions or even straight lemmata which seemingly do not fit in any rational tabulation principle, but are reminiscent of literary expressions, metaphors, images and the like.

<sup>14</sup> It often occurs that a line or expression is misunderstood by a scribe at some point of the tradition; in many cases the text is then creatively adapted by that scribe, in order to restore the sense which was lost, or to replace the original sense by a new one.

<sup>15</sup> As for interpretation and specifically imagery, this point is proven by a high degree of intertextuality with the lexical lists; these often contain clusters of lemmata which are more or less co-extensive with the register of images taken from a certain objective field. See the masterly analysis of bird imagery by J. Black, "The Imagery of Birds in Sumerian Poetry", in: H. Vanstiphout, M. Vogelzang (eds.), *Mesopotamian Poetic Language: Sumerian and Akkadian. Proceedings of the Groningen Group for the Study of Mesopotamian Literature 2* (Groningen, forthcoming). The point of structure and interpretation is borne out by the remarkable degree of intertextuality within clusters of stories. For the 'Matter of Aratta', see e.g. H. Vanstiphout, "Problems in the 'Matter of Aratta'", *Iraq* 45 (1983) 35-42.

<sup>16</sup> A text studied by A. Kilmer gives us the instructions for the musical performance of a royal hymn—a hymn which itself was used for instruction in 'real' Sumerian! (A. Kilmer, "Musical Practice in Nippur", in: H. Behrens et al. (eds.), *Nippur at the Centennial* (Philadelphia 1992) 101-112; H. Vanstiphout, "Lipit-Eštar's Praise in the Edubba", *JCS* 30 (1978) 33-39 and idem, *How did they learn Sumerian?* (as in n.7). A. Kilmer has also made a thorough analysis of the possibly musical (perhaps even operatic) performance of the Old Babylonian Atrahasis epic; A. Kilmer, "Fugal Features of Atrahasis: the Birth Theme", in: Vanstiphout, Vogelzang (eds.), *Mesopotamian Poetic Language* (as in n.15). On the role of the singer (Sumerian: NAR) versus the scribe, see also B. Alster, "Interaction of Oral and Written Poetry in Early Mesopotamian Literature", in: M. Vogelzang, H. Vanstiphout (eds.), *Mesopotamian Epic Literature: Oral or Aural?* (Lewiston 1992) 23-69; J. Black, "Some Structural Features of Sumerian Narrative Poetry", in: idem, 71-101.

<sup>17</sup> See above n.7.

with what we can learn about the activities of a scribe after he left school. The picture seems to be that, after leaving school, the majority of the young scribes entered one of the manifold branches of administration, and, as far as we can judge, stayed there. This probably means that after the general education, a specific branch of bureaucracy was chosen by—or more probably for—the young scribe, and that from now on he would learn the tricks of his particular trade on the job. The prosopographical evidence which we possess points in this direction. Yet this leaves us with a cluster of conundrums. Why is there this growing importance attached to the copying of literary texts (in very neat copies one must admit) in the later stages of scribal education?<sup>18</sup> Who did this, and for what purpose?<sup>19</sup> Where do the graduates go who have spent much time on the great literary tradition? Where are the great administrators recruited—those who do not spend their working life in just one branch? Finally, how was the faculty of the great schools recruited, and what did these people do besides teaching on the preparatory and intermediate levels?

The answers to these questions may well be interrelated. Furthermore, we can at the very least calibrate our speculations by the simple and straightforward means of looking at the material objects, i.e. the tablets. In this respect we are helped by two things. First, there is the distribution of tablet types covering the literary tradition. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, we possess a number of tablets which we call *Catalogues*. These list a number of opening lines of literary compositions, opening lines which serve as titles, as Papal Bulls still do. These texts, of which we now possess a butcher's dozen for the Old Babylonian period,<sup>20</sup> in combination cover fairly

---

<sup>18</sup> One can tell this by comparative study of the tablets and their distribution, which leaves little room for doubt on the point.

<sup>19</sup> For an interesting study of the purposes of writing (from the scribes' point of view) in later times, see L.E. Pearce, "Statements of Purpose: Why the Scribes Wrote", in: M. Cohen et al. (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll* (Bethesda 1993) 185-193. As yet there is no comparable study of the Old Babylonian period. As is stated below, the material shows that the whole structure and intention, and not just the bulk of the literary curriculum, of scribal education changed after the break in the middle of the second millennium.

<sup>20</sup> See J. Krecher, "Kataloge, literarische", in: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 5 (1978) 478-485; to this annotated list must now be added P. Michalowski, "A New Sumerian 'Catalogue' from Nippur", *Oriens Antiquus* 19 (1980) 265-268; S.N.

well the major literary works we know. Admittedly, some entries have not yet been identified, and some compositions cannot be found in the catalogues; but on the whole the correspondence is strikingly close. On the one hand this is a pity, since it implies that to hope that excavation will turn up very important and completely unknown new compositions is vain; but on the other hand it is a good thing, since it gives us at least a small measure of certainty consisting in the observation that by now we have a reasonably good idea of the extension and articulation of the Standard Sumerian literary system<sup>21</sup> in the Old Babylonian period.

The spread and articulation of this literary system is relevant. Thus we find in the *narrative mode* at least three types of composition. There are narratives about the actions of the gods at the beginning of time, which we call myths.<sup>22</sup> As it happens, these are much more about organisation, ordering and procreation than about creation proper. There is also a group of narratives about the famous dynasty of Uruk; one group describes how Sumer uses its cultural and moral superiority to achieve supremacy; another group is concerned with the great heroic and tragic figure of Gilgamesh. Thirdly, there are some pieces that narrate episodes from the saga concerned with the kingdom of Agade—the first unified kingdom in Mesopotamian History. In the *lyric mode* there are again distinct groups: one is usually called hymnal literature, but since “hymn” is not a useful generic concept I would distinguish them as follows: *odes* to the king, or the temple, or the city; *appellation poems*, i.e. poems which make an appeal to a royal or divine personage; *psalms* of praise; and *prayers*. An important sub-group, which as a whole also contains mixed

---

Kramer, “Three Old Babylonian balag-Catalogues from the British Museum”, in: N. Postgate et al. (eds.), *Near Eastern Studies in Honour of I. Diakonoff* (Warminster 1981) 206-213; W.W. Hallo, “Notes from the Babylonian Collection, II: Old Babylonian HAR-ra”, *JCS* 34 (1982) 81-92; P. Michalowski, “Observations on a Sumerian Literary Catalogue from Ur”, *JCS* 36 (1984) 89-92.

<sup>21</sup> It is to be regretted that there is at present no adequate overview of Sumerian literature. Provisionally one may consult D.O. Edzard, “Literatur”, in: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 7 (1987) 35-48; J. Krecher, “Sumerische Literatur”, in: W. Röllig (ed.), *Altorientalische Literaturen*, Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, Bd. 1. (Wiesbaden 1978) 101-150; a number of translation anthologies; see e.g. Th. Jacobsen, *The Harps That Once...* (New York 1987); J. Bottéro, S.N. Kramer, *Lorsque les dieux faisaient l'homme* (Paris 1989).

<sup>22</sup> It should always be borne in mind that these ‘myths’ are highly systematised and poeticised in almost every case. ‘Poems about mythological subjects’ would therefore be a much apter denomination.

lyrical and narrative discourse, is about the shepherd god Dumuzi and his faithless paramour Inana. Here we find pure *love poetry*, but also elegiac pieces mourning the death of Dumuzi. There are a few *elegies* unconnected with this matter as well. Another special type created near the beginning of the second millennium consists of the great *historical complaints* describing the destruction of the great Sumerian cities—and therefore of civilisation—, but holding out hope for their eventual rebirth. *Gnomic* and/or *reflective poetry* occurs in the form of collections of proverbs—we have at least twenty-seven of these, mostly arranged according to general topic—, of riddles, fables and short exemplary stories.<sup>23</sup> There are also a few longer pieces showing reflective wisdom which, I am afraid, is more of the calibre of the wisdom of Polonius than of Hamlet. *Didactic literature* is present, though not very remarkably so: there are poetic treatises on agriculture, but, as one might expect, the technical content is not really harmonised with the poetic format. This means that where the utilitarian function is direct and clear, the poetry is shoddy and *vice versa*. Much more entertainment can be obtained from a relatively large class of compositions directly and explicitly related to the *Eduba* itself. Thus we have texts telling us about life at school, its nature and the expectations it gives rise to; about the behaviour of pupils and teachers—and parents—and so on. Also there are a number of texts known as “Examination texts”. These pieces give a third indication of the shape of the curriculum.<sup>24</sup> They never functioned as real examination pieces, for the simple reason that they have as their format the ancient, typically bad examination question: Do you know this or that?—the correct answer to which is of course a simple yes or no. Also, and very significantly in this group, there are fictitious dialogues, the first and foremost of which are the splendid *Disputation Poems*.<sup>25</sup> These Disputation or Debate Poems are really very

<sup>23</sup> See in general B. Alster, *Studies in Sumerian Proverbs* (Copenhagen 1975).

<sup>24</sup> The first two are the catalogue texts and the tablets themselves.

<sup>25</sup> See J.J.A. van Dijk, *La sagesse suméro-accadienne* (Leiden 1953); H. Vanstiphout, “On the Sumerian Disputation between the Hoe and the Plough”, *Aula Orientalis* 2 (1984) 239-251; idem, “The Mesopotamian Debate Poems. A General Presentation (Part I)”, *Acta Sumerologica* 12 (1990) 271-318; idem, “Lore, Learning and Levy in the Sumerian Disputations. A Matter of Form, or Substance?”, in: G.J. Reinink, H. Vanstiphout (eds.), *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Mediaeval Near East*, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 42 (Leuven 1991) 23-46; idem, “The Mesopotamian Debate Poems. A General Presentation. Part II: The Subject”, *Acta Sumerologica* 14 (1992) 339-367; idem, “The Banquet Scene in the

interesting, in that they show very clearly a preoccupation not only with the correct use of Sumerian in argument, but also with the technique of scholarly debate. Although the Debates do have an explicit outcome—one of the non-human contenders is declared the winner, mostly on rhetorical points—the basis of the argument consists of very clever variations on *sic-et-non* matters. This almost pure form of quodlibetal argumentation is very refreshing in view of the later perversions of the originally witty genre in religious environments; for example, it is never very hard to predict the outcome of a Debate between the Church and the Synagogue, nor is the reasoning proposed difficult to guess.

This all too short and general overview gives rise to five pertinent remarks.

(1) There is no literature to speak of outside this *Eduba* environment. True, there are allusions to the court, but hardly any to the temple. Some kings boast about their intellectual achievements—but they state explicitly that these take place within the *Eduba*. A special kind of literature which seems to be directly related to the temple does exist: ritual texts, mostly composed out of the debris of the historical lamentations. But these are kept apart from the *Eduba* catalogues, and their performers are constantly being mocked in the lighter modes of literature. The temple singer, or *kalū* priest, is presented as a figure of fun, known for his arrogance and stupidity; one cannot be surprised about this when one reads the wretched material they had to perform.

(2) The material allows us to reconstruct in some detail the life of this literary system within the *Eduba*, and this in three ways. First of all, we see that the system itself, being an articulated and living generic system, grows and expands and becomes more precise over the years. Thus we see new kinds of literature growing up against the background of older types. The historical lamentations are a splendid case in point: having at least five more or less complete pieces, we can follow the genesis and the evolution of the genre in considerable detail, even including the ultimate indignity whereby the genre is plundered to provide stock phrases for the ritual 'literature'. Not only are the compositions themselves recopied; they are

---

Mesopotamian Debate Poems'', *Res Orientales* 4 (1992) 9-22. Reinink, Vanstiphout (eds.), *Dispute Poems and Dialogues in the Ancient and Mediaeval Near East* is a collection of studies about the genre in various Near Eastern literary traditions.

also reworked and recomposed in a number of cases, with the result that we can distinguish several versions. On the whole, the tendency visible in these alterations is towards greater lucidity and a stricter organization. It can also happen that completely new compositions crop up. The case of the so-called myth about the 'Ordering of the Universe by the god Enki' is illustrative: this has almost no narrative content—wherefore the term 'myth' seems hardly appropriate—but consists of a lengthy description of the major parts of the universe, including the natural and the human spheres, whereby these are ascribed to the tutelage of the diverse divinities. Moreover, such exiguous narrative content as there is, is only understandable in the light of other and unconnected compositions: a remarkable instance of intertextuality.<sup>26</sup> It is obvious that this is no ancient story about the gods; it is a new and ordered list of the main and relevant parts of life, and a dedication thereof to the college of great gods. It should be added, by the way, that the organisation of the catalogue texts is not random: they group together, for instance, stories about or poems dedicated to the gods; stories about earlier times; 'learned' texts such as didactic literature and the Disputations etc. The implication is that the Sumerian scribes themselves had explicit ideas about the generic system, and thus that they knew what the role and function of genre was.<sup>27</sup>

(3) Although there are small individual discrepancies, the shape, outline and articulation of the system is on the whole identical in all major cities: the curriculum is about the same in Ur, Nippur, Sippar, Kish, Babylon etc. This may mean that the teachers or the faculties of the diverse schools had regular meetings, or that they travelled between these scholarly cities, much as scholars still do, *mutatis mutandis*. In any case it means that one curriculum was accepted in the whole country as being necessary and sufficient.

(4) In some catalogue texts the lines identifying the literary compositions are matched with references to the great 'scientific' works:

---

<sup>26</sup> It makes use, by the way, of the opening motif of Sleeping Beauty: the always difficult and irrepressible goddess Inana thinks that she is permitted only an insufficient share in ruling the world; when she objects, Enki, the great organiser, replies that she stands for controversy, which is all-pervading and not related to any specific part of the universe. There is no good dependable modern edition. One may consult the translation in: Bottéro, Kramer, *Lorsque les dieux* (as in n.21).

<sup>27</sup> See H. Vanstiphout, "Some Thoughts on Genre in Mesopotamian Literature", in: K. Hecker, W. Sommerfeld (eds.), *Keilschriftliche Literaturen* (Berlin 1986) 1-11.



the lexical lists; the grammatical lists; the god lists (showing the structure of the divine world in tabulated form); and also what is referred to as *Šummū*: the widespread casuistic literature, or the technique of *if . . . then*, which underlies not only jurisprudence but also divination.<sup>28</sup> These matters were not, or hardly ever, taught in the second or general stage of education, and, as with the real literary tradition, they seem to be reserved to the third stage.

(5) Lastly, the material shows that the Babylonians regarded this literary and scientific occupation as the highest achievement within the *Eduba* cursus. The care bestowed on the tablets shows this, as does the point within an *Eduba* education where the now fully educated scribe is allowed to pursue a literary and scientific career, presumably aiming at a teaching post as well. There is a special residual point to be made at this juncture. The group of compositions treating directly of school and school life, and the closely related Dialogues and Disputations may have had a special significance here. Their insistence on the school and its curriculum, combined with the fact that they consistently present these school-days as being over, i.e. from the point of view of an *alumnus*, makes it not unreasonable to regard this class of works as being functional in the stage leading from general education to higher education. In this respect the Dialogues—and certainly the Disputations—take on new significance: would it be too bold to presume that the entrance to higher education, in the form of acceptance into the intellectual and literary brotherhood or fellowship, took the form of a *viva voce* disputation in Sumerian? We know by inference that there was a not unimportant intellectual or literate class: the many tablets of high quality witness this, as does the school system itself. And we even have some terms indicating a kind of collegiate system running the school: under the supervision of the *ummiā*—the head of the school—there were a number of *šēš-tab-ba*, which literally means ‘Brother-Fellows’. Such a person was apparently different from the *šēš-gal-la*, ‘the big brother’, who seems to have been a mature pupil. Yet the Academic career was presumably restricted to only a few people. Still, when one glimpses the achievements ascribed to some of the great administrators, who may have risen to provincial governors or

---

<sup>28</sup> For the term *šummū* in its specialised meaning of ‘legal formulae’, which in Ancient Mesopotamia were casuistic by nature and necessity, see P. Michalowski, *Observations* (as in n.20).

viceroy or ambassador one wonders whether these scions—who sometimes are daughters—of the great families (including the royal family), had not also partaken in this form of higher education.

In parenthesis it should be noted that the next period of which we have an appreciable amount of material is the Sargonid period (c.721-627 BCE), which shows a very different state of affairs.<sup>29</sup> One observes that the almost liberal, humanistic, general values so manifest in the fairly independent Old Babylonian *Eduba* have apparently been lost. The scribes have become mere civil servants; intellectual and literary pursuits are seemingly no longer undertaken for their own sake; everything is made subservient to the needs of the royal person and/or his plans and policies. From the letters these ‘scholars’ sent to the court,<sup>30</sup> it appears that they were only expected (and permitted?) to undertake well-circumscribed activities: they are astrologers, diviners, exorcists, physicians or lamentation chanters. It is typical that one *Ummia*, in presenting twenty of his alumni to the court, mentions only a few among them as being proficient in *tuṣṣarrūtu*, lit. “‘tablet learning’”—which was once the source and pinnacle of all education and learning.<sup>31</sup> Yet we know from the actual tablets that the work of careful copying (and editing and reworking) the great works of literature as well as the great works of science (e.g. the astronomical and astrological handbooks; the divinatory handbooks, the philological and lexical works. . .) still went on, albeit that the extent, range, articulation and presumably status of the material changed much in the second half of the second millennium. The people who kept on doing this in their own way, and who would appear to have more right to the title ‘scholar’ than the civil servants reporting to the court, are unknown to us—unless they are the same as these civil servants. In any case, it remains unclear where their activities took place, and what their role in society was. About the *Eduba* itself we hear next to nothing.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> See M. Vogelzang’s contribution to this volume.

<sup>30</sup> See H. Hunger, *Astrological Reports to Assyrian Kings*, SAA 8 (Helsinki 1992), and S. Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, SAA 10 (Helsinki 1993).

<sup>31</sup> Parpola, *Letters* (as in n.30) 120-124, letter no.160.

<sup>32</sup> With one important exception which may well have great relevance: one of the primary texts about the ‘examination system’—admittedly to be taken *cum grano salis*—, viz. ‘Examination Text A’, is known almost exclusively in late exemplars from the ‘royal’ libraries in Niniveh and Assur. But there can be little doubt that it is Old Babylonian in origin; see Sjöberg, *Examenstext A* (as in n.7).

In conclusion, some further remarks may be offered. It is clear that the literary curriculum circumscribed the written literature of Old Babylonian Mesopotamia within the environment of the *Eduba*. It is also clear that this is the first articulated and explicit generic system of literature, not merely on record, but in history as such. Furthermore, it appears that this generic system, willingly relating itself to 'science', functions as a model of which we see the next manifestations only much later and at other places. No genetic relationship is claimed; the intention of the present writer is merely to point out the great and structural similarities. The most important of these seem to consist of the following:

(a) the textual basis of the whole system of learning—textual primarily because it takes writing much more than language as its cognitive basis, and because the vehicle is a dead language;

(b) the tendency towards organisation of knowledge in the form of lists which by their structure more than by their extension assume completeness as to knowledge of the world;

(c) the tendency towards free debate on all and sundry subjects, whereby the verdict is granted on points of rhetoric, and not on prejudice.

For all these reasons it can be stated with confidence that the Old Babylonian *Eduba* fulfilled a most important, even essential, role in the spread of literature<sup>33</sup> and ordered knowledge, both of which were 'invented' at this institution and on its behalf. As yet we cannot pursue the direct or indirect aftermath of this early intellectual adventure in much detail, mainly because of the huge gaps in tradition. But it seems obvious that a refusal to look seriously at this early system of learning in the context of the spread of organised knowledge would constitute an irresponsible act of intellectual nihilism, prejudicial in origin and destructive in effect, and would not be an example of scientific caution, as is sometimes assumed.

---

<sup>33</sup> It must be stressed over and over again that this was 'literature-as-we-know-it', and that it was a substantial and indispensable part of education and the growth of knowledge. The epistemological reason why repeated emphasis on this point remains necessary was elegantly expressed by E. Sollberger, late keeper of the Western Asiatic Antiquities Department of the British Museum, who stated that 'la crainte de dire, et de redire, ce qui 'va sans dire', est souvent mauvaise conseillère'.

## LEARNING AND POWER DURING THE SARGONID PERIOD

M.E. VOGELZANG

*Maître et esclave sont vraiment dans la même histoire: la royauté temporaire de l'un est aussi relative que la soumission de l'autre.*

A. Camus, *L'homme révolté*.

This paper will confine itself to learning and power during the Sargonid Period, an interesting and important historical period in ancient Mesopotamia (721-627 B.C.) and one about which we are reasonably informed.

At the outset, therefore, it seems appropriate to present a short summary of what we know in general about schools and education in Mesopotamia.<sup>1</sup> Much of our knowledge of schools and education comes from the Sumerian Ur III period and the Old Babylonian period, roughly covering the twenty-second to the seventeenth centuries B.C. The Sumerian school system flourished particularly in the second half of the third millennium, and tens of thousands of clay tablets have been excavated from this period. Most of them have an administrative content, and they cover every phase of Sumerian economic life. A Sumerian school was called the *Eduba*, the 'tablet house', and 'Junior' and 'senior' scribes attached to the palace or a temple worked there. Some of them specialized in particular administrative activities. The head of the *Eduba* was the *Ummia*, *ummānu* in Akkadian: the 'specialist, expert', a word which came later to mean a specific sort of trader, a scholar, artist or moneylender. In general it means men who have been given a professional training. The scribal school was organised as a company of craftsmen, more or less as if it were a craftsmen's guild. The *Ummia* was the 'father', the apprentice the 'son'. The *Ummia* was supported by several lower officials, one of whom was the *Sheshgal*, literally 'the big brother', who was probably a kind of supervisor.<sup>2</sup> An important function of

---

<sup>1</sup> See in general: W.H.Ph. Römer, *Iets over school en schoolonderzoek in het oude Mesopotamië* (Assen 1977); H.L.J. Vanstiphout, "How did they learn Sumerian", *JCS* 31 (1979) 118-126.

<sup>2</sup> Whether or not George Orwell knew of this function is open to question, but the concept "Big Brother is watching you" has certainly been a meaningful one for longer than one might think.

the *Eduba* was the training of students to become *Dubsar*, 'Tablet-writer', in various specialisms and services.

By examining the texts which were copied by the students in the schools we can obtain an impression of the material which played a role in education. Advanced students copied series of texts and lists of vocabulary, grammatical, mathematical exercises, legal texts, notarial documents and contracts, economic texts, and letters with a business or diplomatic content, in Sumerian as well as in Akkadian. The schools also gave language classes in Sumerian, both passive and active. There were also classes in ancient Mesopotamian literature: classes which were concerned with passing on the complete theological, literary and—perhaps the most important aspect of it all in those days—traditional heritage. Lists of gods and incantation texts, for example, give us insights into religious and cultural traditions. It appears that scribes in particular, in the broadest sense of the word, were trained to be the bearers of the traditional learning of the time.

It must be remembered that the essence of the texts which formed the traditional literature was regarded as *holy*. This is clear not only from the fact that a divine origin was ascribed to many of the texts, but also from the manner in which these books were quoted. The quotations were often preceded by the words "it is written" or "one says". According to the Babylonian priest Berossus (third century B.C.), who, on the orders of Antiochus I, wrote in Greek a history of Babylonia<sup>3</sup> from the Flood to Alexander the Great, all the knowledge and crafts that men know were taught to them by the fabulous fish-man Oannes at the beginning of time, and since then nothing worthwhile had been discovered. Tradition was therefore not only a factor which determined culture; it was also the force which kept a check on literary and scientific creativity. Of course factors such as military expansion, increase in knowledge, and social and economic expansion played a part in a gradual change in the Mesopotamian view of the world, and made revisions and reinterpretations to a certain extent unavoidable. Thus literature, too, became gradually standardised and modified into a more systematic and schematic whole, as a result of continual study and rewriting. New works were composed and incorporated into the Mesopotamian tradition. The

---

<sup>3</sup> The so-called *Babyloniaka*; see P. Schnabel, *Berossus und die Babyl.-hellenistische Literatur* (Leipzig 1923) 253; and *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, Teil B, Band 2, 1-17.

corpus of letters discussed here shows many traces of these aspects of literary occupations.

We do not know exactly how long the apprenticeship of the scribes lasted, but it must have been many years, especially for those who wanted to continue their studies beyond the standard or basic education. The *Ummia* were most probably chosen from these highly educated scribes. The position of the scribe, the *Dubsar* or *tupsharru* in Akkadian, must have been an important one, because the indispensable ability to read and write gave respect and power. The student copied the tablets in order to learn from them, but sometimes also to make a reproduction of the original, for his teacher, his 'master' or for himself—the usual way of building up a collection. Scribes and scribal schools attached to temples or palaces enjoyed a certain degree of economic security and freedom, and this was shown by an increase in interest in specialised topics. This in turn led to an increase in the number of tablets dedicated to the purpose of learning: such collections we now call libraries. To cite Oppenheim: "Such libraries have been found in Assur and in Sultantepe as well as in many of the sites in southern Mesopotamia which have not been excavated by professionals but were plundered toward the end of the nineteenth century. But one should stress that a library in our sense, a systematic collecting of texts copied for the purpose of being included in such a collection, existed in Mesopotamia solely in Niniveh".<sup>4</sup> The fixing of the literary material in Sumerian, but also partly in Akkadian, was completed by the Ur III period and the Old Babylonian period. The Kassite period which followed produced only a few new Sumerian text genres, but many more Akkadian ones. The Babylonian-Assyrian scribes were thus working on a sort of canonisation which led to a reassessment of what was to be preserved and passed on. The choices made then appear to have determined just which literary material survived in Neo-Babylonian, the literary form of Akkadian from the first half of the first millennium B.C. In what follows we shall be concerned with scholars from that period and their relationship to royal power.

The term *Sargonid* is a term which for the sake of convenience will be used to refer to the last kings of the powerful Assyrian state, from Sargon II (721-705 B.C.) to the disappearance of Assyria as an

---

<sup>4</sup> A.L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago 1972; 1st ed. 1964) 235-249, esp. 243.

empire, the fall of which actually took place after the death of the famous king Assurbanipal in 627 B.C.. Four of these kings—Sargon II, Sanherib, Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal—became the most famous figures from Mesopotamian history as the result of their numerous inscriptions, their diplomatic and palace correspondence, and not least their beautiful monuments. The famous library of Assurbanipal in Niniveh has provided us with a wealth of literature, which is a reflection of centuries of literary traditions of all kinds, carefully copied and collected. Many texts were copied for the library in a standardised form and executed with the greatest of care.

The royal archives also contained a corpus of several hundred Neo-Assyrian letters, addressed to kings Esarhaddon (680-669 B.C.) and Assurbanipal (668-627 B.C.). These letters were brilliantly translated by the Finn Simo Parpola in 1983.<sup>5</sup> His books and thesis form the main source and ‘Leitmotif’ of this article. This corpus of texts from ancient Mesopotamia forms a suitable basis for our general theme because it gives us a *glimpse* of the relationship between ‘scholars’ and ‘authority’. Much of the knowledge of these scholars was based on what had been preserved over the centuries and written down; in principle it is not very different from modern-day scientific research. The letters are only a small part of a much bigger royal Sargonidic correspondence. In turn, the correspondence is only a fraction of the whole imperial archives of Niniveh. According to Parpola there are 41 complete, 86 well-preserved and 241 fragmentary letters. With the exception of four, none of them are dated or address the king by name. They contain many useful chronological clues, however, which can be used to determine the dates of the individual letters. As Parpola’s study has shown, around four fifths of the correspondence dates from the time of Esarhaddon; the rest can be attributed to Assurbanipal.

The content of the corpus is not uniform. In addition to letters exchanged between the king (or crown-prince/queen-mother) and scholars attached to the royal court, there are also petitions from

---

<sup>5</sup> S. Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars to the Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal*, Part I: Texts (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970) and Part II: Commentary and Appendices (1983); idem, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, SAA 10 (Helsinki 1993). This reworking of the material appeared too late to be taken in consideration. And S. Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian Scholars*, Part IIa: Introduction and Appendixes (Academic Dissertation; Kevelaer-Neukirchen/Vluyn 1971). Hereafter cited as I, II and IIa.

unemployed scholars, and a number of lunar observations from scholars who were employed in various other Assyrian cities. The majority of the letters, however, are indeed written by people who must have had a fairly close relationship with the king.

This correspondence gives an excellent insight into the everyday actualities of the balance of power. All the obsequious tricks still used today are evident: submissiveness, despair, flattery, the fear of failure and of being left to fend for oneself for the rest of one's life; the abuse that would result for the immediate and the extended family and which could have consequences for the future; the fear that one has made a mistake in research, overlooked something, or even if there is no mistake, the feeling of knowledge of not having struck the right note. The correspondence also gives an insight into the relationships between the scholars and the institutionalised power, quite apart from the official propaganda which we usually receive from that same power.

Parpola's publication of this correspondence has shown that the scholars can be divided into five specialised groups: the *scribe* (*tupsharru*), *haruspex* (*bārū*), *exorcist* (*āshipu*), *doctor* (*ašū*) and *singer* (*kalū*).<sup>6</sup> Each of these groups, as mentioned by Parpola, may be briefly characterised, as follows.

*The Scribes.* They were specialised in the observation and interpretation of omens, miscarriages, hemerology and menology. The literal translation of *tupsharru* 'scribe' is not really accurate in this particular sense, but 'astronomer' is also misleading, even though that is the primary meaning of the Hebrew word \**tapsar* and its later equivalent *Kasdī* (Chaldean; Greek: *Chaldaios*). We also meet the technical literature of the scribes in our corpus of letters—that is: handbooks, extensive commentaries on them, and short summaries of larger works for quick reference. An essential part of the activities of the 'scribe' was the observation of the moon at the beginning and the middle of each month. This watch was not only necessary for the observation of important periodic omens, but was also important for the calendar. The data acquired by these observations provided the scribes with a respectable amount of astronomical knowledge. The interpretation of celestial phenomena cannot have been an easy task and the results of such observations were sometimes challenged

---

<sup>6</sup> Parpola, *Letters* II, XIV; IIa, 12-15.



bluntly by other scholars. In letter 65 a scholar writes: “He who wrote to the king that Venus is visible [in the month of Add]aru, is a vile man, a dullard (and) a cheat”! And he also writes: “If he does not know, [he should] keep his mouth shut”.<sup>7</sup> But every now and then, even the most competent scholar could not always supply a suitable answer, and had to admit that no reference to this particular phenomenon could be found. And our letters sometimes show the increasing impatience of the king with the lack of straightforward answers.

*The Haruspices*: “readers of entrails, soothsayers”. The soothsayers were important because they were able to read what the will of the gods was in matters of great importance (war, plague, religion) by studying the entrails of sacrificial animals (usually the liver, but sometimes other organs). To judge by the reports and by the letters, the inspection of the entrails was done by a group of haruspices.

*The Exorcists*. This group of scholars specialised in magic, that is: they tried to influence and fight supernatural forces with magic spells, rituals and curses. As supernatural forces were not only regarded as the cause of sickness, but also of other calamities, the domain which the exorcist had to control appears to have been very large. The letters alone show the wide range of their activities but the medical function was the most common: the banishing of demons from the sick body by means of exorcism, ritual practices and magic amulets. Another important part of their work had to do with cult activities: the consecration of divine statues, the ritual cleansing of certain places and objects during burial rites, important ritual festivals, etc.

*The Doctors*. The activities of the doctors overlapped with those of the exorcists and we often find them working together. In general one can say that what the exorcist tried to achieve through magic, the doctor tried to achieve through the prescription of medicines and other methods of treatment.

*The Singers* (or Appeasers). They specialised in the conciliation of supernatural forces by the singing of complicated songs, accompanied by a sort of drum. The general idea behind their activities was that all kinds of evil omens, disasters and calamities were the direct

---

<sup>7</sup> Parpola, *Letters* I, 43.

manifestation of divine wrath, and this could be deflected or at least lessened by means of a 'conciliation' of the gods.

The scholars known from our corpus of letters can be divided into two groups, where it concerns their relationship with the king. Parpola uses the terms 'inner' and 'outer circle' for them.<sup>8</sup> For the sake of simplicity I shall use the terms first and second circle.

The first circle appears to have been made up of men with a high social position, but there was probably not very much contact between these scholars and the king. Parpola assumes that they were not all permanently in the palace, despite being attached to the court, but lived in their own private houses, and only occasionally appeared at court when circumstances demanded. The Assyrian court, however, appears to have supported a great number of scholars, who were specialised in more or less the same disciplines as those who made up the first circle; still more such scholars were spread out over the Assyrian empire. The group of sages who regularly took part in correspondence with the king was made up of a very select group. Other scholars could write a letter to the king every now and again, and even elicit a reply from him; but such exchanges appear to have been restricted and exceptional.

The second circle of scholars in the correspondence was made up of those who did not reside at the royal court in Niniveh. They all appear to be members of teams of scholars or the spokesmen for such teams. Their sporadic correspondence was possibly the result of royal decrees in order to confirm or adjust obscure solar and lunar observations made in the capital. Here, too, it is only the very highly placed scholars, or the leaders of a team of scholars, who appear as the correspondents of the king.

Parpola's study of the group of prominent scholars has brought a very important fact to light; namely, that the family contacts of the first circle were all with the same prestigious family with a continuous scribal tradition which stretched over a period of at least 250 years.<sup>9</sup> The discovery of the family links between members of the first circle is very interesting. In the first place it appears that the important positions of the educated advisors at court were in the hands of privileged families—Parpola calls them "a veritable scholarly mafia"—who held the monopoly of these positions from generation

---

<sup>8</sup> Parpola, *Letters* II, XIV-XVII.

<sup>9</sup> Parpola, *Letters* II, XVII-XVIII.

to generation. The letters make it clear, however, that the position of the father was not automatically passed on to the son.<sup>10</sup> It was in fact the king who made the appointments to the various offices, and he obviously took account of the individual qualifications of the available candidates. The fact that one was the son of someone in a particular office did, however, help in the selection process. It must have been exceptional for a son not to succeed in taking over his father's position, and this would be a disaster for the family concerned. Where this did happen, the choice would probably fall on a member of a different family; one which also had an ancient tradition of honourable scholarliness.

In his Introduction Parpola reconstructs the pedigree of one of these families.<sup>11</sup> This has brought an interesting fact to light about the scientific orientation of the family: their professional competence has been widened. He suggests that a possible reason for this is the intense competition for positions at court between the rival scholarly families. Because the available positions were presumably limited in number and only open to the 'very best', young scholars who despite everything did not succeed their fathers in a position at court were not only forced to produce top marks, but were encouraged to study a wide range of subjects. It is the opinion of the present writer, however, that these successful candidates in addition to their high scholarly gratification, were probably also blessed by being born under a lucky star, and by enjoying the support of their families.

As Parpola has also remarked,<sup>12</sup> it is not surprising that echoes of rivalry, competition and the fight for the available positions do not often feature in the corpus of letters. The writers of these letters were comparatively safely entrenched in the highest available positions.

---

<sup>10</sup> Parpola, *Letters* II, XVII. This is shown in letters 120, 121 and 122. They tell of the poor scholar Urad-Gula, as described by his father. In the first letter the father shows a little of his anxiety concerning his son. In the second letter he approaches the relationship in a more rigorous and emotional way. The last letter contains a reaction to the answer that Urad-Gula's father has received from the King (Assurbanipal). The first impression is that everything has been sorted out, but a careful perusal of the letter, especially of lines 2/3: "What the king, my lord, wrote to me: 'I have gathered you, your nephews (and) your cousins, you belong (now) to my entourage (. . .)'" reveals a different result. The family is indeed named, but not the sons; see S. Parpola, "The Forlorn Scholar", in: F. Rochberg-Halton (ed.), *Language, Literature and History: Philological and Historical Studies presented to Erica Reiner* (New Haven 1987) 257-278.

<sup>11</sup> Parpola, *Letters* II, XIX.

<sup>12</sup> Parpola, *Letters* II, XVIII.

In spite of this, there are echoes occasionally heard. For everything possessed by scholars attached to the court—fame, respect, privileges—was dependent on their royal master. As a result of this, these scholars could theoretically find themselves in the situation where they could lose everything if royal favour should turn against them for whatever reason. It is, therefore, only to be expected that we can find traces of the consequences of such a rigidly ordered social situation in the tenor of the letters: submissiveness and servility towards the king; arrogance, jealousy and hate towards their colleagues and other individuals who were seen as a threat to their position.<sup>13</sup>

All this should sound familiar to modern readers, even though we read these letters, which were never meant for our eyes, from the point of view of quite another age, and with a completely different cultural background. This distance indeed means that it is often not easy to understand this correspondence or to see it in its true perspective. We can only agree with Parpola that it cannot be denied that many of these scholars were in service to the king and played an important role in the prediction of the future, and thus played an important part in the decision-making process with regard to the political future. Parpola says that it is important for us to realise “the overwhelmingly passive and ‘academic’ nature of their advisory role”. Also, that nearly all the letters should be understood as answers to the pressure exercised on these scholars by the king—who wanted specific answers to specific questions—and which compelled direct professional action. But whatever the situation, the content and the direction of the answer from the particular scholar was “in all its essential features dictated by the relevant scholarly literature, not by his personal views or ambitions. In other words, the role of the scholar was mainly that of (in Parpola’s words) an automaton or a robot, who gave the leader the chance to protect himself, and who offered a future to his own personal ambitions with the help of the traditional Mesopotamian knowledge”. Any attempt to depart from that basis would be strongly opposed by the king.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Although the Mesopotamian terms (Sumerian: *ki-gub-ba*; Akkadian: *man-zāzu*) are etymologically exact equivalences of ‘position’, the concept of ‘position’ in Mesopotamian society is rather difficult to pin down. But the general term ‘position’ is of course a rather difficult concept. Through the ages of human life, it appears that its ‘significance’ and ‘value’ is dependent on political, social and religious traditions and circumstances. The same accounts for instance for terms like ‘humbleness’ and ‘servility’.

<sup>14</sup> Parpola, *Letters II*, XVIII-XIX.

The terms ‘robot’ and ‘automaton’, are perhaps not such very good choices, and it is questionable whether they are really supported by the facts. In addition, Parpola goes on to contradict himself somewhat by saying that it would be a mistake to assume that the scholars in this corpus blindly accepted all the knowledge and observations of their forefathers and applied them in practice. They too were busily adding to and disseminating the new scientific knowledge of their time.<sup>15</sup>

The letters do show that the scholars certainly did their best to appease the king. The letters are full of flattery and little tricks to ensure that the king would feel favourably disposed towards the scholars who wrote them, and the latter did their very best to ensure that he would in no way be irritated by a display of scientific uncertainties or lack of knowledge—complicated matters of letter and court etiquette. This further underlines the social chasm which existed between the king and his learned subordinates.

As mentioned above, the scholars were concentrated around the person of the king. They belonged to the first circle: men who were possibly permanent members of the court, or else lived in their own houses in Niniveh, or were spread throughout the Assyrian Empire in other important centres. Their leaders found themselves in rather influential positions: as the personal advisors of that same king. This immediately begs the question: Why did they need to write letters? Most of them were already at court, after all. Would it not have been much simpler to meet the king and discuss the matter verbally? Parpola asks the same question, but only in his 1971 thesis. It is not discussed in his later 1983 publication. His 1971 solution was that the scholars could not see or speak to the king whenever they wanted to; the position and the status of the king implied that the time he had to receive people (including his courtiers) was very limited. He could not give private audiences to everyone who wanted to discuss ‘practical things’ with him “without risking his royal aura and authority”.<sup>16</sup> There is surely some difficulty here with the term ‘practical’: what is more practical than direct verbal contact, certainly if one is already a member of court? But perhaps there is more behind it than this, and the fact that everything was recorded in writing is perhaps important. In oral reports or discussions words can fly around

---

<sup>15</sup> Parpola, *Letters* II, XXI.

<sup>16</sup> Parpola, *Letters* IIa, 21-22.

regardless. If a discovery has to be recorded in writing then one is more inclined to play safe in accordance with the maxim: "everything that you write can be used against you". Whatever the reason, according to Parpola "the best way to communicate with the king (even for the people living in the palace) was to write letters".<sup>17</sup>

A second question which arises is this: how were kings such as Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal personally able to judge the merits of the learned advice given to them? Were they not dependent on the interpretations and advice of the scholars who were at court? And if there were already scholars at court, why was it necessary to call on scholars who lived outside the capital? All in all it must have been a heavy burden on the shoulders of the responsible scholars, but this is possibly a too modern and liberal interpretation. Some letters make allusions to the fact that a certain advisor had 'lied' to the king. This more or less means that his interpretations differed from the traditional ones, and that his neck or position was at risk. Who would be so 'foolish'? Is not a differing interpretation evidence of the existence of different 'schools'? And what was the role of the king in all this? We can hardly expect an unduly great degree of scientific interest and background from the king. It is therefore both understandable and to be expected that he would play safe. But for many scholars there is and was a difference when it came to converting theory into practice. Parpola also briefly discusses this, saying: "Here the scholars were left with more range to move, and their subjective thoughts and feelings, finding expression in the comments and advices, came to play a greater part".<sup>18</sup>

Finally, the manner in which our letters discuss the advice and suggestions is very characteristic. The dominant factor is courtesy and 'deep respect'. Suggestions (in the precative) are often accompanied by one of the following phrases: "if it is acceptable to the king, my lord"; "if it is convenient"; "if the king, my lord, says so"; "if it seems good: the king, my lord, should act as he wishes", etc.<sup>19</sup> Whether and how much influence the scholars had on the king has yet to be investigated. So too the reverse, although the first is the more interesting. The correspondence shows that the relationship between the king and the scholars can, for the moment, best be

---

<sup>17</sup> Parpola, *Letters* IIa, 21.

<sup>18</sup> Parpola, *Letters* IIa, 23.

<sup>19</sup> Parpola, *Letters* IIa, 24-25.

described as that between a master and his servants. This is more or less in agreement with the way in which the scholars define it at the beginning of each letter. The same can also be said about the relationship between the king and most of the powerful figures in the Assyrian empire: the provincial governors and those who held the top military and administrative posts. In their letters they address the king in the same manner as that of the scholars, and in fact they were just as dependent on the whims and caprices of their royal master. It nevertheless appears that the scholars of the empire enjoyed great respect as the direct successors of the legendary and famous historical predecessors of the “seven sages of the period of the great Flood”. Their services were indispensable to the king as they provided the royal family with medical assistance, protection against magic, evil demons and angry gods, the possibility of obtaining a glimpse of the future, or explanations when strange things were observed. Their services had equally a direct influence on the ins and outs of kingdom and community in general. And indeed, without ‘learning’ (scholars), but also without ‘power’ (royal regulation), “there would have been no royal libraries, no royal inscriptions, no regulation of the lunar calendar, no knowledge of the auspiciousness of days and months for royal enterprises”.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Parpola, *Letters* II, XX.

## THE FAMILY AND OTHER CENTRES OF RELIGIOUS LEARNING IN ANTIQUITY

JAN N. BREMMER

When I reached the age of twelve, I naturally joined the religious instruction classes which my father, a staunch Calvinist minister, gave once a week. He still used the Calvinist *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563), of which he himself had brought out a new Dutch edition, and we mercilessly had to learn all its questions and answers by heart. I only remember the shortest one: 'Question: From where do you know your misery? Answer: From God's Law.' The tradition of Christian religious instruction may go back to the very beginning of Christianity, since Paul's first letter to the Corinthians (15:1-8) seems to presuppose instruction to new believers before their christening; the last chapter of Matthew (28:14f.) also combines christening and teaching. If these passages are not indisputable evidence, the testimony of the *Didache* (7.1) clearly establishes a link between instruction and christening, but that is virtually all we know about earliest Christianity. Yet, by the end of the second century there existed a full-blown catechumenate, as seen in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, and Tertullian already knows that it could last as long as three years. After Constantine, the increasing growth of the church made such a long waiting period impossible and the instruction reverted to concentrating again on the period immediately before the christening. This instruction was—and is (I still remember my father once breaking his pipe over the head of a noisy farmer's son)—not always an easy one and, interestingly, around 400, Augustine issued a small treatise on this instruction, *De catechizandis rudibus*, which also contains suggestions for how to make catechism more attractive.<sup>1</sup>

The roots of Christian instruction can probably be found in Jewish practice, in particular, perhaps, that of the ascetic community of Qumran (1QS6.14ff.). Outside the Judaeo-Christian tradition,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. V. Saxer, *Les rites de l'initiation chrétienne du ii<sup>e</sup> au vi<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Spoleto 1988); G. Kretschmar, "Katechumenat/Katechumenen", *TRE* 18 (1989) 1-5.



though, we almost never hear of formalised religious instruction in the ancient world. That is to say—never before 1991. In that year a Berlin papyrologist, William Brashear, found among his collection the scraps of what looked like a Mithraic catechism with questions and answers. For example: ‘He will say: ‘Who is the father?’. Say: ‘He who generates everything’.’<sup>2</sup> The papyrus is dated to the fourth century. The absence of any mention of religious instruction before that period strongly suggests that the followers of Mithras had decided to compete with the fast-growing Christianity by adopting its specific system of religious instruction,<sup>3</sup> just as the priests of Attis had introduced a resurrection of their god into their mysteries in Late Antiquity, and Iamblichus had embellished the traditions about the followers of Pythagoras with details derived from the Christian monks.<sup>4</sup> Success breeds imitators, not only in the real market place but also in the market for symbolic goods.

If, then, formalised religious instruction was absent in Greek and Roman societies, how did they transmit religious knowledge to their young? The question is rarely put and not even touched upon in the current standard handbooks of Greek (M.P. Nilsson and W. Burkert) and Roman (G. Wissowa, K. Latte, G. Dumézil) religion, undoubtedly because there is so little information.<sup>5</sup> I will start in Greece, for which we have at least a few detailed passages at our disposal.

### *Ancient Greece*

The most important centre of religious learning was undoubtedly the immediate family. When in a fourth-century oration, the plaintiffs want to demonstrate that they are the children of Ciron’s

---

<sup>2</sup> W. Brashear, *A Mithraic Catechism from Egypt* ‘P. Berol. 21196’ (Vienna 1992) summarised as ‘Ein mithräischer Katechismus aus Ägypten in Berlin’, *Antike Welt* 24 (1993) 2-19, but also note the doubts of R. Turcan, ‘Un ‘catéchisme’ mithriaque’, *CRAI* 1992, 549-564; idem, *Mithra et le Mithriacisme* (Paris 1993) 152-156.

<sup>3</sup> On instruction by questions and answers see H. Dörrie and H. Dörries, ‘Erotopokriseis’, *RAC* 6 (1966) 342-370; A. Garzya, ‘Appunti sulla erotapokriseis’, *Vetere Christianorum* 29 (1992) 305-314.

<sup>4</sup> This element of competition is curiously overlooked by Jonathan Smith, *Drudgery Divine* (Chicago 1991).

<sup>5</sup> The exception confirming the rule is H. Cancik, ‘Römischer Religionsunterricht in apostolischer Zeit’, in: H. Feld, J. Nolte (eds.), *Wort Gottes in der Zeit. Festschrift für Karl Hermann Schelkle* (Düsseldorf 1973) 181-197, to which I am much indebted.

daughter, they offer the following proof, which is our most valuable testimony of religious transmission for Greek children—for sons, that is:

For, as was natural, seeing that we were the sons of his own daughter, Ciron never offered a sacrifice without our presence; whether he was performing a great or small sacrifice, we were always there and took part in the ceremony. And not only were we invited to such rites but he also always took us into the country for the festival of the Dionysia, and we always went with him to public spectacles and sat at his side, and we went to his house to keep all the festivals; and when he sacrificed to Zeus Ktesios [the guardian of family possessions]—a festival to which he attached a special importance, to which he admitted neither slaves nor free men outside his own family, at which he personally performed all the rites—we participated in this celebration and laid our hands with his upon the victims and placed our offerings side by side with his, and took part in all the other rites, and he prayed for our health and wealth, as he naturally would, being our grandfather.<sup>6</sup>

From this description we can clearly see how young boys learned religion by attending the rites performed by their family in the house and in communion with others during festivals, and how at an early age they could modestly participate in sacrifice, the most important Greek ritual activity, which every citizen could conduct on his own authority. Indeed, Herodotus was amazed that the Persians had to call upon a Magus to perform sacrifice (1.132), but in Greece, religious authority was widely fragmented and there was no Greek equivalent to Christian ministers, Jewish rabbis or Islamic mullahs.

In passing, we note that the boys will also have learned how to pray, since prayer was an important part of sacrifice. This is also clear from an only slightly less instructive passage in Plato, in the course of a discussion of the existence of the gods. The Athenian participant in the dialogue observes that nowadays people disbelieve

the stories heard so often in earliest infancy, while still at the breast, from their mothers and nurses—stories, you may say, crooned over them, in sport and in earnest, like spells—and heard again in prayers offered over sacrifices, in conjunction with the spectacle which gives such intense delight to the eye and ear of children, as it is enacted at a sacrifice, the spectacle of our parents addressing their gods, with

---

<sup>6</sup> Isaeus 8.15f, tr. E.S. Forster (Loeb).

assured belief in their existence, in earnest prayer and supplication for themselves and their children.<sup>7</sup>

When Plato continues with “at rising and setting of sun and moon, they (children) have heard and seen the universal prostrations and devotions of mankind”, we realise that from an early age children also learned how to move during prayer, just as contemporary Christian children learn how to hold their hands and their body during prayer at a very early age.<sup>8</sup>

When the boys entered the ephebate, a kind of military service, they were allowed to demonstrate their physical prowess during sacrifice. Male adolescents led the victim to the altar and “in the way of the Greeks” (so Euripides, *Helen* 1562), lifted up the animal to have its throat cut. This custom is attested in many texts and inscriptions; in fact, the sixth-century athlete, Milo of Croton, had already gained great fame for lifting a four-year old bull on his shoulders and carrying it round the stadium at Olympia. Modern spectators of bulls or oxen will probably question the possibility of this feat, but ancient Greek bovids were considerably smaller than those of today. For example, in seventh-century Samos, as the bones of the excavated sacrificial remains show, sacrificed cows were only between 95 cm and 1,15 m high; one bull measured 1,26 m and an ox 1,35. Ephebes themselves, therefore, could not yet sacrifice, but they became more and more involved in the sacrificial process. When they reached adulthood, they were allowed to kill the sacrificial victims with their own hands.<sup>9</sup>

Divination was also a not unimportant part of the sacrificial ritual, be it from the liver (hepatoscopy) or from the behaviour of the tail, which was burned separately. As the office of seer (the *mantis*) often ran in families, the technical knowledge must have regularly been learned by frequent attendance. The general, Xenophon, writes that his seer could not deceive him during a sacrifice, since he himself had picked up the necessary experience in this area (*Anabasis* 5.6.29). In the fourth century, though, the knowledge of the

---

<sup>7</sup> Plato, *Laws* 887d, tr. A.E. Taylor.

<sup>8</sup> For the influence of culture on gesture and posture see J. Bremmer, H. Roodenburg (eds.), *A Cultural History of Gesture* (Cambridge 1991).

<sup>9</sup> Ephebes: F. Graf, *Museum Helveticum* 36 (1979) 14f. (fullest collection). Milo: Athenaeus 10.412ef. Samos: J. Boessneck, A. von den Driesch, *Knochenabfall von Opfermahlen und Weihgaben aus dem Heraion von Samos* (Munich 1988) 22.

seer could already be handed down differently, as we learn from the trial speech, *Aiginetikos* (19.5f.), by Isocrates. The successful seer, Polemainetos, himself childless, chose Thrasylos to be his successor and bequeathed him his 'art', his money, and his books.

The mention of books is rather striking, since they played no role in Greek religion except for a few 'sects', such as the Orphics. In general, it can be said that the use of writing in the transmission of religious ideas only started to become really important in Hellenistic times and we naturally think of Christianity as the prime example of a religion propagated by means of letters and tracts. Yet, even the use of the written word in the spread of Christianity should not be overestimated. Its Holy Book was hardly translated by early missionaries and the number of papyrus fragments of the books of the New Testament dating from earlier than the year 200 is strikingly small.<sup>10</sup>

Unfortunately, we know almost nothing about the role played by girls during rituals in the family circle, but they also attended sacrifices at home, as votive reliefs show, and, thus, they will have learned about the sacrificial ritual in much the same ways as boys. This was a necessity for girls because, even though males were the main sacrificers in Greek ritual, women had to sacrifice by themselves during the most important Greek women's festival, the Thesmophoria. Moreover, sacrifices at festivals were important moments in the life of aristocratic girls, since, at the front of the sacrificial procession, an aristocratic girl (the *kanephoros*) walked with a beautiful basket on her head. The basket was sometimes made of silver, or was even gold-plated, and it contained the sacrificial knife, covered by barley-groats and ribbons. We may conclude, then, that Greek children were socialised into religious practice by participation and imitation.<sup>11</sup>

Yet religion does not consist of rituals only. The great French historian, Marc Bloch, once drew attention to the fact that in rural

---

<sup>10</sup> W.V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge Mass. 1989) 299. Harris's discussion of Christian literacy has to be read with the important criticism by N. Horsfall, in: J.H. Humphrey (ed.), *Literacy in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor 1991) 73-76.

<sup>11</sup> Women sacrificing: U. Kron, "Frauenfeste in Demeterheiligtümern: das Thesmophorion von Bitalemi", *Archäologische Anzeiger* 1992, 611-650; R. Osborne, "Women and Sacrifice in Classical Greece", *Classical Quarterly* 43 (1993) 392-405. Both authors convincingly refute the well-known thesis of Marcel Detienne that Greek women were excluded from sacrifice.

societies, before the introduction of the newspaper and a more formalised education, the youngest generation was generally educated by the oldest. As working conditions kept the parents away from home during the day, the young children were brought up chiefly by the grandparents. Of the grandparents the grandmother was the mistress of the household and it was she who took charge of the narrative activity of the group, the proverbial old female storyteller of Perrault or the Grimm Brothers. In other words, the most malleable were moulded by the least flexible.<sup>12</sup>

In Greece, the situation was not so very different. In the passage quoted above, Plato tells us that children heard stories about gods from their mothers and nurses from an early age onwards. This feature of ancient society is surely one of the reasons why stories of Greek mythology retained their popularity during the whole of antiquity. The custom can be traced back to the fifth century, since a character in Euripides' *Melanippe Sophe* (fr. 484N<sup>2</sup>) says, before telling a cosmogony, "it is not my *mythos*, but I had it from my mother".<sup>13</sup> It is only in the fourth century that we start hearing of silly stories being called 'old wives' tales', an expression which the Greeks could still use in a literal sense. Plato lets Socrates say that *mythoi* have to be criticised and that nurses have to be persuaded to tell the children only those *mythoi* which could stand up to examination. In this passage of the *Republic* (377), Socrates does not reject all *mythoi*, but in the *Gorgias* he apparently assumes that Kallikles will consider myths about the underworld to be "old wives' tales" (527a). Here the expression is already used in a proverbial manner as an equivalent of nonsense. Evidently, more enlightened circles were discarding the ancient traditions.<sup>14</sup>

After their earliest youth, children also heard about their religious

---

<sup>12</sup> M. Bloch, *The Historian's Craft* (New York 1953) 40f.; see also R. Schenda, *Von Mund zu Ohr. Bausteine zu einer Kulturgeschichte volkstümlichen Erzählens in Europa* (Göttingen 1993) 183.

<sup>13</sup> It is rather surprising that the mother tells a (possibly Orphic?) cosmogony. Is this an allusion to the fact that the Orphics were rather popular among upper-class women? Cf. F. Graf, "Dionysian and Orphic Eschatology", in: T. Carpenter, C. Faraone (eds.), *Masks of Dionysus* (Ithaca/London 1993) 239-258.

<sup>14</sup> Plato and old women: M. Detienne, *L'Invention de la mythologie* (Paris 1981) index, s.v. 'vieilles femmes'; L. Brisson, *Platon, les mots et les mythes* (Paris 1982) 69; J.N. Bremmer, "The Old Women of Ancient Greece", in: J. Blok, P. Mason (eds.), *Sexual Asymmetry. Studies in Ancient Society* (Amsterdam 1987) 191-209, esp. 201-202.

traditions on other occasions. Isaeus' oration mentions the attendance at the rural Dionysia and, indeed, festivals must have been an important occasion for boys to watch sacrifices and to listen to plays or poetic performances. Boys and girls themselves also performed during some of these festivals. For example, Arcadian boys practised in choruses songs in which their national heroes were celebrated, and in this way they learned their local mythology, presumably the stories about the hero, Arcas, and others. Cretan boys also had to learn certain songs 'prescribed by the laws', and these will not have been very different from the Arcadian ones. For girls, too, the chorus was for long the most important place of education, where they learned to move properly and to sing about the traditions of their hometown—i.e. about exemplary female adolescents and male ancestors.<sup>15</sup>

In addition to festivals, the *symposion* must also have played an important role in the transmission of religious knowledge, since it was the stage for didactic poetry during the Archaic Age, witness Theognis. These poems will have been important in transmitting moral knowledge, which in earlier Greece was inseparable from religious knowledge. But instruction at the *symposion* took place in a different manner as well. In Aristophanes' *Clouds*, performed in 423, Strepsiades tells the chorus-leader: "When we were feasting, as you know, first of all I asked him to take his lyre and sing a song by Simonides, 'How Sir Ram was shorn' [about the defeat of a famous wrestler]; but he at once said that that was antiquated, playing the lyre and singing at a drinking-party, like a woman grinding hulled barley" (1356ff.). And a character in a comedy of Antiphanes, undoubtedly a boy, says: "Don't string out any of those old-fashioned songs, the 'Telamon' or the 'Paeion' or 'Harmodios'" (fr. 85 Kassel-Austin). Evidently, boys had to learn about and, subsequently, glorify the heroic deeds of mythical and historical heroes, examples they should look up to in their own life.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Fundamental for girls' choruses is C. Calame, *Les choeurs de jeunes filles*, 2 vols. (Rome 1977); see now also S.H. Lonsdale, *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion* (Baltimore/London 1993) 169-205.

<sup>16</sup> For boys and songs, see J.N. Bremmer, "Adolescents, *Symposion*, and Pederasty", in: O. Murray (ed.), *Symptica* (Oxford 1990) 135-148.

*Ancient Rome*

In ancient Rome, too, education at all levels of society was originally informal. As far as I can see, only the late-antique Prudentius has imagined what pagan education was like:

Children in their infancy drank in the error with their first milk; while still at the crying stage, they had tasted of the sacrificial meal (...) The little one had looked at a figure in the shape of Fortune (...) and watched his mother pale-faced in prayer before it. Then raised on his nurse's shoulder, he too pressed his lips to the flint and rubbed it with them, pouring out his childish petitions (...) And then when he went abroad, and lost in wonder viewed the public festivals on national holy days with their games, and saw the lofty Capitol, the laurelled priests standing at the temples of their gods, and the Sacred Way resounding with the lowing cattle before the shrine of Rome... he would think that what is done by the senate's authority must be genuine, and so gave his faith to the images...<sup>17</sup>

Prudentius, it appears, saw religious instruction as a primarily informal affair and this must certainly have been true for sacrifice, since children of every age are always present on Roman sacrificial reliefs. In more specific cults, the fine details were learned 'on the job', since many Roman cults made use of young boys and girls to sing the relevant hymns or to perform more menial tasks. This was the case with the sons of senators who assisted the *Fratres Arvales*; we also hear that the eldest Vestal virgin instructed the youngest one in how to carry out her ritual duties.<sup>18</sup>

Religious education in Rome, then, was informal and orally transmitted.<sup>19</sup> The importance of oral transmission must also be appreciated from the custom that sons of senators originally were allowed to be present at the debates in the senate. When, however, a mother pestered her son about the content of the debates, which

---

<sup>17</sup> Prudentius, *Contra Symmachum* 1.201-24, tr. H.J. Thomson (Loeb). On Prudentius, see now A.A.R. Bastiaensen, "Prudentius in Recent Literary Criticism", in: J. den Boeft, A. Hilhorst (eds.), *Early Christian Poetry. A Collection of Essays* (Leiden 1993) 101-134.

<sup>18</sup> Cults: G. van der Leeuw, *Virginibus puerisque. A Study on the Service of Children in Worship*, Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie der Wetenschappen, Afd. Lett., NR 2, no.12 (Amsterdam 1939). *Arvales*: J. Scheid, *Romulus et ses frères* (Rome 1990) 535-541. *Vesta*: Valerius Maximus 1.1.17.

<sup>19</sup> This is also stressed by J. Scheid, "Rituel et écriture à Rome", in: A.-M. Blondeau, K. Schipper (eds.), *Essais sur le rituel II* (Louvain/Paris 1988) 1-15.

were traditionally secret, he told her, in order to be left in peace, that they had discussed whether husbands could take a second wife. Highly indignant, the mother mustered her 'sisters' and besieged the senate, where they soon learned that they had been duped. After this (surely legendary) incident, boys only accompanied senators to the door of the Curia and waited there patiently. Undoubtedly, they will have heard in this way also about religious matters, since the elite totally dominated Roman public religion.<sup>20</sup>

Somewhat surprisingly, we never hear about religion taught at school, either in Greece or in the Roman Empire. When we look at the many papyrus fragments containing schoolboys' exercises, the almost complete absence of religious subjects may even amaze us. The preferred subjects of these texts were misogynistic or, be it to a lesser extent, expressive of the importance of filial piety. Religion, evidently, was never recognised in pagan circles as an important subject at school. It is interesting that the Christians followed the pagan example completely and likewise excluded religious instruction from their curriculum.<sup>21</sup>

In this context it cannot be thought striking that Prudentius nowhere mentions the school, which, in principle, would have been a perfectly possible venue for religious education in a time when schools were ubiquitous. In fact there is only one text which explicitly speaks of religious education. In his *Silvae*, the first-century poet Statius mentions the religious instruction which his father gave in Naples. He taught the three main fields of Roman religion, *sacra*, *auspicia*, *praedictio*, and concentrated on the requirements for the main Roman priesthoods, such as the *Fratres Arvales* and the *Salii* (5.3.176-84). His main educational aim was the transmission of religious traditions to boys who were destined to be the future Roman priests. Yet even he apparently only taught the most elementary facts; the higher religious education, so to speak, had to take place on the job, that is in the actual practice of priesthood. The case of Statius' father is unique, and it may be relevant that he taught in Naples not in Rome. In Rome such education may well have been

---

<sup>20</sup> Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 1.23; Valerius Maximus 2.9.

<sup>21</sup> Papyri: R. Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Diss. Columbia University 1993) 162-166. Christian schools: E. Pack, "Sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte des Fehlens einer 'christlichen' Schule in der römischen Kaiserzeit", in: W. Eck (ed.), *Religion und Gesellschaft in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Cologne/Vienna 1989) 185-263 (exhaustive, if not exhausting, bibliography).



superfluous, but boys who did not regularly see the Salii, Arvales or Luperci with their own eyes were in need of instruction.

The religious education of Greek and Roman children, then, was informal and participatory. In this respect, ancient societies did not differ from, for example, traditional African societies where, via and in the course of performance, children are (were?) taught their religious roles in the all-embracing network of kinship relations.<sup>22</sup> For this informality there is, however, another reason as well. Religion was such an integrated part of Greek life that the Greeks lacked a word for 'religion'. When Herodotus wants to describe religions of the neighbouring peoples of Greece, he uses the term "to worship the gods", *sebesthai tous theous*, and when he wants to describe the Greek nation, he speaks of "the common blood, the common language and the common sanctuaries and sacrifices" (8.144.2). In other words, for Herodotus, the problem of describing foreign religions can be reduced to the question "which (other) gods do they worship and how."<sup>23</sup> The same observation can be made for Rome, where *religio* is anything but religion in our modern sense.<sup>24</sup> If religion is not recognised as a separate category, how can there be religious instruction?<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Cf. G. ter Haar et al., *African Traditional Religions in Religious Education* (Utrecht 1992) 29-51.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. W. Burkert, "Herodot als Historiker fremder Religionen", *Entretiens Hardt* 35 (1990) 1-32, esp. 4; see also F. Mora, *Religione e religioni nelle storie di Erodoto* (Milan 1986).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. E. Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* II (Paris 1969) 267-272. For the rise of 'religion' as an anthropological category, see T. Asad, *Genealogies of Religion* (Baltimore/London 1993) 27-54 and K. Rudolph "Inwieweit ist der Begriff 'Religion' eurozentrisch", in: U. Bianchi (ed.), *The Notion of "Religion" in Comparative Research* (Rome 1994) 131-139, both of whom overlooked J. Bossey, *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700* (Oxford 1985) 170.

<sup>25</sup> I am most grateful to Alan Swanson for his revision of my English.

## THE CHRISTIAN 'SCHOOL' OF ALEXANDRIA IN THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES

ROELOF VAN DEN BROEK

For our knowledge of the Christian school at Alexandria, as for so many other aspects of early Christian history, we are almost completely dependent on Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. Eusebius reports<sup>1</sup> that "of old a school of sacred learning" existed among the faithful of Alexandria. The first school-head he knew by name was Pantaenus, whom he assigns to the first years of Commodus (180-192), but he takes it for granted that the school itself had been in existence long before that time. "This school", Eusebius continues, "has lasted on to our time, and we have heard that it is managed by men powerful in their learning and zeal for divine things." This remark shows that he had no exact knowledge of the status of the school in his own days; it was only by hearsay that he knew that it was led by excellent scholars. The question arises whether he was better informed on the school's earlier history. Eusebius' information on the Alexandrian school, in Books 5 and 6 of his *History*, deserves a very critical reading. What did he really know and what did he simply infer from the sources at his disposal? Was there a school at all, in the sense of an established institution of learning and education? Or were there in Alexandria independent teachers only?<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 5.10. In the following, Eusebius' *History* is quoted after the edition by E. Schwartz, *Eusebius: Kirchengeschichte*, Kl. Ausgabe (Berlin 1952, 5th ed.).

<sup>2</sup> The traditional view of the Alexandrian school follows uncritically the presentation of the facts as given by Eusebius, so e.g. W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia 1984) 286-289. For a more critical evaluation of Eusebius' report, see G. Bardy, "Aux origines de l'école d'Alexandrie", *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 27 (1937) 65-90; H. Koch, "Origenes", *RE* 18.1 (1939) 1036-1039; M. Hornschuh, "Das Leben des Origenes und die Entstehung der alexandrinischen Schule", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 71 (1960) 1-25, 193-214; P. Nautin, *Origène. Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris 1977). For the views of some German and French scholars of the nineteenth century, see A. le Boulluec, "L'École d'Alexandrie: De quelques aventures d'un concept historiographique", in: *AAEEANAPINA. Hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie, Mélanges offerts au P. Claude Mondésert* (Paris 1987) 403-417. J.H. Ellens, *The Ancient Library of Alexandria and Early Christian Theological Development*, Occasional Papers of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity 27

The first aspect I wish to discuss is the tradition that the Alexandrian school, like the great philosophical schools of Antiquity, knew a real *successio* of teachers who themselves had been the pupils of their predecessors. According to Eusebius, Origen was a pupil of Clement, who in his turn was pupil and successor of Pantaenus.<sup>3</sup> He does not explicitly say that Origen was Clement's successor, but at least the suggestion is made when he reports that Clement headed the school until the persecution of 202 and that Origen was in his eighteenth year, that is in 203, when he became head of the "Catechetical School" (τῆς καταχήσεως διδασκαλείον).<sup>4</sup> The same *διαδοχή*, from Pantaenus to Origen, is found in Photius' reading report of the *Apology for Origen*, which about 300 had been written by Pamphilus and Eusebius and, unfortunately, is now lost except for a few fragments. But Photius gives also some additional information on the teachers of Pantaenus: it is said that he had been the pupil of teachers who had known the apostles, and even that he had heard some of the apostles themselves.<sup>5</sup>

Another tradition about the teachers of the Alexandrian school was transmitted by Philip of Side, who between 434 and 439 wrote

---

(Claremont 1993), not hampered by any knowledge of the relevant texts, comes to some 'sturdy conclusions', *inter alia* that "Philo Judaeus stood solidly in the center of the scholarship and tradition of the Alexandrian Library and its university center, as it functioned in his day, and may well have been the dominant figure in that scholarly community of his time" (p.28), and that "The Catechetical School continued and elaborated in an Hellenistic mode the scholarship of the Ancient Library of Alexandria in such detail that it must be concluded that the Catechetical School was an inheritor of that Library's role and heritage, either as a corollary institution or as the very continuation of the library and university center itself" (p.29)! Ellens' views on the influence of the Library and Philo on the development of Christian theology from the second through to the fifth centuries (p.29: "The Ancient Library of Alexandria, through the influence of the thought of Philo Judaeus, shaped all subsequent Christian theology . . . from the Catechists through Tertullian (*sic!*) to the Council of Chalcedon in 451 C.E.") are so completely wrong that it would do them too much honour to refute them.

<sup>3</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.6 (Origen a pupil of Clement) and 6.13.2 (in his *Hypotyposes*, Clement mentioned Pantaenus as his teacher).

<sup>4</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.3.3. This date was inferred by Eusebius from his sources since he only knew of one persecution, that of Laetus (202). But most probably Origen started his catechetical instruction during the persecution of Aquila, who was prefect of Egypt between 206 and 210/211. See Nautin, *Origène* (as in n.2) 38-39, 363-364. Origen did not become head of "the Catechetical School", but he gave religious instruction to the pagans who came to him when all catechists had fled the city (*Hist. Eccl.* 6.3.1).

<sup>5</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 118, ed. R. Henry (Paris 1969) II, 91. For the *Apology* by Pamphilus and Eusebius, see Nautin, *Origène* (as in n.2) 99-153.

a voluminous but chaotic *Christian History*. In its 24th book he inserted a list of thirteen Alexandrian school-heads which ran from Athenagoras in the second half of the second century to Rhodon, the successor of Didymus the Blind, at the end of the fourth century. According to Philip, this Rhodon had been his teacher, after he had transferred the school from Alexandria to Side in the time of Theodosius the Great (379-395).<sup>6</sup> I only mention this peculiar list because it shows that about 400 the idea of a *διαδοχή* of Alexandrian teachers reaching back to at least the second half of the second century was well established, as it was at Alexandria, it seems, if we assume that Philip had become acquainted with this list through the intermediary of Rhodon, the former Alexandrian teacher.

Nevertheless, the whole idea of a Christian school with a *διαδοχή* of teachers handing down a fixed tradition of learning to their pupil successors is completely false, at least until the second decade of the third century. Origen never mentions his alleged predecessor Clement. Eusebius' remark that Origen had been one of Clement's pupils is sheer guesswork, as can be seen from the historian's own choice of words.<sup>7</sup> As a matter of fact, it seems quite improbable that Origen ever attended Clement's courses. The latter's works, especially the *Stromateis* and what is left of the *Hypotyposes*, show that his teaching was addressed to advanced students in philosophy and religion, and not meant for beginners, even if they were as brilliant as the young Origen.

That Clement did not take over the direction of an existing school in the usual sense will also become clear when we look at the position of the Christian teacher within the Christian Church. Before he came to Alexandria, Clement had studied with Christian teachers

---

<sup>6</sup> For the text, see G.Chr. Hansen (ed.), *Theodorus Anagnostes Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin 1971) 160. Philippus' list contains the following names: Athenagoras, Clement, Pantaenus, Origen, Heraclas, Dionysius, Pierius, Theognostus, Serapion, Petrus, Macarius, Didymus, and Rhodon. There is no evidence for any connection between Athenagoras and the Alexandrian School; the order of Pantaenus and Clement and of Theognostus and Pierius has been inverted; Achilles, who probably came after Pierius (see Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 7.32.30), is missing. On this list, see B. Pouderon, "Le témoignage du codex *Baroccianus* 142 sur Athénagore et les origines du *Didaskaleion* d'Alexandrie", *Archipel Égéen*, Publication de l'Université de Tours, Département d'études Helléniques (1992, fasc.1) 23-63; as stated on p.23, this study also appeared in "Mémoires XII" of the University of Saint-Etienne.

<sup>7</sup> Eusebius, *HE* 6.6: Κλήμης . . . τῆς κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν κατηχήσεως εἰς ἐκείνου τοῦ καιροῦ καθηγεῖτο, ὥς καὶ τὸν Ὠριγένην τῶν φοιτητῶν γενέσθαι αὐτοῦ.

in Greece, Magna Graecia, Syria and Palestine. His last teacher, though “the first in power”, as he says, he found “hidden in Egypt”.<sup>8</sup> Eusebius was the first to make the reasonable guess that this last teacher, “the Sicilian Bee”, as Clement calls him, was no other than Pantaenus, since we know from Clement himself that he had heard the lectures of Pantaenus.<sup>9</sup>

According to Clement, it was through all these teachers, who together with their predecessors are called by him οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, that the true apostolic teaching had come down to him. He says literally:

These teachers, then, preserved the true tradition of the blessed doctrine derived directly from the holy apostles Peter, James, John, and Paul—the son receiving it from the father, but few were like the fathers. By God’s will, then, they came also to us to deposit those ancestral and apostolic seeds.<sup>10</sup>

It will be clear that the later tradition which connected Pantaenus with the pupils of the apostles and even with some of the apostles themselves has its origin in this passage of the *Stromateis*. It also explains why Sozomenus in his *Ecclesiastical History* could say that Clement (and Hegesippus) “followed in the διαδοχή of the apostles.”<sup>11</sup>

It should be noticed, however, that Clement speaks of *all* his teachers, not only of the one he found in Egypt. Through these teachers “the true tradition of the blessed doctrine” of the apostles had come down to him. What is really astonishing here is that Clement claims a *successio apostolica*, which is also a *successio veritatis*, not for the bishop but for the διδάσκαλος. Just as the bishops of his time propagated the view that each individual bishop derived his authority, also in matters of doctrine, through his predecessors from the apostles, so Clement holds that it is the διδάσκαλοι of the Christian world who follow in the διαδοχή of the apostles. This seems to have been a typically Egyptian view. In Alexandria, and later on also in the Egyptian χώρα, lay teachers played an eminent role in the church.<sup>12</sup> There are strong indications that in second-century

---

<sup>8</sup> Clement, *Stromateis* 1.11.1-2.

<sup>9</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.13.2.

<sup>10</sup> Clement, *Stromateis* 1.11.3.

<sup>11</sup> Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccl.* 1.1 (PG 67, 860A).

<sup>12</sup> In the middle of the third century, bishop Dionysius convoked τοὺς πρεσ-

Alexandrian Christianity the διδάσκαλοι and the πρεσβύτεροι continued the roles of the rabbis and elders of the Jewish community.<sup>13</sup> The teachers were responsible for all forms of religious education, from pre-baptismal instruction to high theology. They were, however, no ecclesiastical officials but laymen. It was inevitable that their independent position and their claim to apostolic authority would lead to a clash with the Alexandrian bishop. In the end the bishop prevailed, and Origen had to leave the city definitively in 234.

It is in this perspective that we have to see the great Christian teachers, the gnostic as well as the non-gnostic, of second-century Egypt. It was their firm conviction that they not only participated in the apostolic tradition but also in the same Spirit which had inspired the apostles. They were in fact charismatic διδάσκαλοι, not holders of academic chairs, incorporated in a school with a fixed curriculum.

This is not diminished by the obvious fact that some of these teachers were deeply steeped in Greek philosophy and Greek culture in general. It also does not mean that there was no real scholarship among the Alexandrian Christians. We know that already in the middle of the second century there existed in Alexandria what has been called a 'scriptorium' which produced biblical texts, established by the methods of textual criticism which had been developed by much earlier Alexandrian scholars for the edition of Greek literary texts.<sup>14</sup> Origen's *Hexapla* continued a typically Alexandrian tradition. It can be shown that the theological views of these early text critics sometimes led them to the conjecture of readings which were certainly false.<sup>15</sup> We may assume that in the second half of the

---

βυτέρους καὶ διδασκάλους τῶν ἐν ταῖς κώμαις ἀδελφῶν in order to convince them that Nepos' doctrine was false (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 7.24.6)

<sup>13</sup> See R. van den Broek, "Juden und Christen in Alexandrien im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert", in: J. van Amersfoort, J. van Oort (eds.), *Juden und Christen in der Antike* (Kampen 1990) 108-111.

<sup>14</sup> See G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles. A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (London 1953) 271-276.

<sup>15</sup> The text-critical expert who corrected the text of P<sup>46</sup>, the Chester Beatty papyrus of the Pauline Epistles (ed. by F.G. Kenyon [London 1936] 81), changed 1 Cor. 13.5: [ἡ ἀγάπη] οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς into οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ μὴ ἑαυτῆς. By this correction he adapted the original reading to an Alexandrian variant which is found in Clement, *Paedagogus* 3.3.2, and in the Codex Vaticanus, reading: οὐ ζητεῖ τὸ μὴ ἑαυτῆς. On this variant, see Zuntz, *Text of the Epistles* (as in n.14) 25; G. Quispel in a review of M. Mees, *Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien*

second century there existed a circle of biblical scholars, Christian γραμματικοί, and well-educated διδάσκαλοι, who knew each other and together were engaged in integrating their Christian belief into the Greek culture they also believed in. Origen's father, Leonides, may have belonged to that circle. These people may have shared some typically Alexandrian views, for instance that the holy Scriptures have a deeper, mystical meaning which can be found only by the method of allegorical interpretation. But there was no school, in the sense of a Christian academy, with a regular teaching programme.

It is only from the second decade of the third century onward that with a certain right we can speak of a Christian school at Alexandria. During the persecution of governor Aquila (206-210/11) all Christian teachers, also those who gave the pre-baptismal instruction, fled Alexandria. Then Origen, who at that time still was a γραμματικός, a teacher of secular literature, began to explain the essentials of Christianity to interested pagans. There is little doubt that Eusebius has mixed up this persecution with that of the year 202, with the result that he assumes that at that time Origen was in his eighteenth year.<sup>16</sup> When the persecution was over, bishop Demetrius, always eager to enhance his episcopal authority, approved Origen's initiative and, according to Eusebius, appointed him head of the "catechetical school" and entrusted "the catechetical instruction to him alone."<sup>17</sup> From then on, that is to say, from about 211, bishop Demetrius seems to have had all religious instruction under his supervision. But this διδασκαλεῖον should not be conceived of as a catechetical institute, housed in a separate building possessed by the church. Origen remained a lay teacher who received his students at home, as Justin Martyr had done before him and Plotinus was to do after him.<sup>18</sup> Eusebius speaks of τὸ παρ' αὐτῷ διδασκαλεῖον.<sup>19</sup> In 217 he divided his pupils into two groups. From then on Origen gave his

---

(Bari 1970), *Vigiliae Christianae* 25 (1971) 309. In this Alexandrian variant of 1 Cor. 13.5, the unselfish Christian love has been changed into the impersonal love of the Platonic Eros.

<sup>16</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.3.1; see above n.4.

<sup>17</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.3.3 and 8.

<sup>18</sup> For Justin, see *Acta Justini* 3.3 (Recensions A and B; ed. H. Musurillo [Oxford 1972] 44 and 50/52), for Plotinus, see Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 9: Plotinus lived and worked in the house of Gemina.

<sup>19</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.15.

lectures to advanced students only, the philosopher Heraclas was entrusted with the introductory courses for beginners.<sup>20</sup> That brings us to the question of what kind of instruction was given in Origen's school. Was it merely religious and theological or was there a more general academic curriculum, including logic, physics and ethics?

According to Eusebius, the school offered a general education: Origen introduced his most gifted pupils to geometry, arithmetic and the other preparatory subjects and then taught them the various schools of philosophers and read and explained their writings.<sup>21</sup> Pierre Nautin has convincingly argued that this report has no historical basis but was simply inferred by Eusebius from what he knew of Origen's teaching at Caesarea.<sup>22</sup> His main source must have been the *Address to Origen*, usually ascribed to Gregory the Wonderworker.<sup>23</sup> According to this farewell speech, delivered about 245, in his Caesarean period Origen followed a teaching programme which contained five progressive steps: 1. a period of moral purification, 2. dialectics, as the most useful part of logic, 3. physics, including geometry (science of the earth) and astronomy (science of the heavens), 4. ethics, and 5. theology.<sup>24</sup> This curriculum is in fact an elaboration of the Stoic division of philosophy into logic, ethics, and physics (including theology); it has distinct parallels in the works of Philo.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.15.

<sup>21</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.18.3.

<sup>22</sup> Nautin, *Origène* (as in n.2) 51-53.

<sup>23</sup> Nautin, *Origène* (as in n.2) 83-86, has argued that the real author of the farewell address was a certain Theodore, whom Eusebius erroneously identified with the famous Gregory the Wonderworker; cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.30: "As the most distinguished of his pupils we know Theodore, who is identical with the Gregory who is well-known among the bishops of our time, and his brother Athenodorus." The most recent edition of the *Address* is that by H. Crouzel, *Remerciement à Origène, suivi de la Lettre d'Origène à Grégoire*, texte grec, introduction, traduction et notes, SC 148 (Paris 1969).

<sup>24</sup> See Nautin, *Origène* (as in n.2) 180-197.

<sup>25</sup> See A.C.J. Habet, *Geschiedenis van de indeling van de filosofie in de Oudheid*, diss. University of Utrecht (Utrecht 1983) 58 (Zeno's *didactic* order of the aspects of philosophy was: logic, ethics, physics), 63 (Cleanthes' order [dialectic, rhetoric, ethics, politics, physics, theology] is a refinement of Zeno's division of philosophy), 64-66 (Chrysippus' *didactic* order was logic, ethics, physics, but according to him the study of ethics in fact presupposes knowledge of the essentials of physics as well, the last stage of physics is theology), 102-108 (Philo adopts the Stoic order but sometimes he puts physics [as the study of natural phenomena] before ethics; sometimes, however, he takes physics in the sense of theology and then puts it after ethics [cf. Chrysippus]). It will be clear that Origen follows the views of Chrysippus and Philo.



According to Nautin, it is inconceivable that Origen taught a similar curriculum already in his Alexandrian period. In his view, Origen at Alexandria was primarily a catechist, especially in the beginning, who became head of an ecclesiastical institute of religious education, from pre-baptismal instruction to speculative theology. His associate Heraclas was charged with the first introduction into Christianity.<sup>26</sup> But the question is, what is meant by τὴν πρώτην τῶν ἄρτι στοιχειουμένων εἰσαγωγὴν, as Eusebius puts it.<sup>27</sup> Στοιχειόω means “instruct in the basic principles”, which can refer to both general education and instruction in religion, in particular pre-baptismal instruction.<sup>28</sup>

I think it very unlikely that Heraclas was responsible for the first religious instruction only.<sup>29</sup> In a big city like Alexandria with its rapidly growing Christian community there must have been a considerable number of teachers who could take care of the pagans who wanted to join the church. Heraclas was a well-known philosopher who continued to wear his philosophical dress even after he had become a member of the Alexandrian clergy, as we know from Origen himself. He had already studied philosophy with Ammonius Saccas for five years when Origen met him for the first time in Ammonius’ school.<sup>30</sup> No less a scholar than Sextus Julius Africanus made a journey to Alexandria because of the great fame of Heraclas, as Julius himself wrote in his *Chronography*. Eusebius, to whom we owe this information, adds that Heraclas excelled in philosophy and the other Greek sciences.<sup>31</sup> So it seems more probable that Heraclas introduced the students to logic, physics and perhaps general ethics, and that Origen limited himself to biblical studies and theology. We may safely assume that the works Origen wrote in Alexandria,

<sup>26</sup> Nautin, *Origène* (as in n.2) 188, also 47-49, 420.

<sup>27</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.15.

<sup>28</sup> See G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961) 1261 s.v.

<sup>29</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.15, says that Origen made Heraclas his κοινωνὸν τῆς κατηχήσεως. The word κατήχησις can mean “instruction; esp. in the faith”, in the sense of both the “act of teaching, instructing” and the “matter of instruction, teaching, doctrine”; in a more specific sense it is a *terminus technicus* for “instruction of those preparing for baptism, catechetical instruction”; see Lampe, *Lexicon* (as in n.28) 733 s.v. Eusebius only says that Origen made Heraclas his teaching partner, not that he assigned to him the pre-baptismal instruction.

<sup>30</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.19.13-14, quoting from one of Origen’s letters. Origen adds that Heraclas still continues to study the books of the Greeks to the best of his ability.

<sup>31</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.31.2.

especially the first books of his *Commentary on John* and his *On Principles*, also reflect essential aspects of his teaching. In my view there is no need to assume, with Nautin, that Origen's teaching activity at Caesarea was something new, to which, moreover, he devoted himself very rarely.<sup>32</sup>

After Origen's departure from Alexandria in 234, the connection between church and school became so close that the two successors who came after him, Heraclas and Dionysius, were both elected bishop of the Alexandrian church.<sup>33</sup> The school-heads became officials of the church, but the bishops seem to have granted them a relatively independent position. One gets the impression that until the end of the school they were real scholars, well versed in Greek sciences and philosophy and in Christian theology, but that the school was primarily a theological academy. To a certain extent, the spirit of Origen remained alive, as can be seen from what is left of the works of Dionysius, Theognostus, and Pierius, "the new Origen", as he was called,<sup>34</sup> but also from the voluminous writings of the last representative of the Alexandrian school, Didymus the Blind. There is no doubt, however, that theologically Didymus was outrivalled by his bishop Athanasius. After Didymus' death the school ceased to exist. Bishop Theophilus (385-412), the declared enemy of paganism and Greek culture, no longer accepted independent theological speculation. From then on, only the bishop was held to be competent in matters of doctrine, and he decided what kind of theology had to be taught in his church.

---

<sup>32</sup> Nautin, *Origène* (as in n.2) 186-188, 434, argues that the programme described by Theodore/Gregory in his *Address to Origen* was developed for this pupil only; in his view, Origen never directed a school, neither at Alexandria nor at Caesarea. His arguments have failed to convince me.

<sup>33</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 6.26 and 29.4.

<sup>34</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 119, ed. R. Henry (Paris 1960) II, 94.



## THE SCHOOL OF EDESSA: GREEK LEARNING AND LOCAL CULTURE

HAN J.W. DRIJVERS

Edessa, modern Urfa in south-east Turkey, was a Seleucid city and later became the capital of the little kingdom of Osrhoene in northern Mesopotamia. Osrhoene was one of Rome's allies in the east and lost its independence in 213 C.E., when the emperor Caracalla made it into a *colonia Romana*. Edessa remained part of the Roman and later the Byzantine empire until its conquest by the Muslims in 639 C.E. Very little is known of Edessa's history during the Seleucid period. When the power of the Seleucid kings declined, an Arab dynasty installed itself in Edessa about 132 before C.E. and ruled the city and its surrounding area until the beginning of the third century C.E. The kings bore characteristic Arab names like Abgar and Ma'nu.<sup>1</sup>

In Roman times Edessene culture was thoroughly bilingual, and Greek and Aramaic were both in use. The same pattern prevailed in other cities in Roman Syria, like Palmyra and Dura-Europos. Edessa and the neighbouring area have consequently yielded Greek as well as Syriac inscriptions.<sup>2</sup> A recent find of two Syriac and seventeen Greek papyri, mainly legal documents from the first half of the third century, originates in the Edessene region and was part of a family archive.<sup>3</sup> It is noteworthy that the archaeological and

---

<sup>1</sup> See H.J.W. Drijvers, "Hatra, Palmyra und Edessa. Die Städte der syrisch-mesopotamischen Wüste in politischer, kulturgeschichtlicher und religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung", *ANRW* II,8 (Berlin/New York 1977) 799-906, 863-896 (with bibliography); F. Millar, *The Roman Near East 31 BC-AD 337* (London 1993) 472-481.

<sup>2</sup> R. Schmitt, "Die Ostgrenze von Armenien über Mesopotamien, Syrien bis Arabien", in: *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit*, Beiheft Bonner Jahrbücher 40 (1980) 187-214, 200-202; G.W. Bowersock, *Hellenism in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge 1990) 29-40.

<sup>3</sup> D. Feissel, J. Gascou, "Documents d'archives romains inédits du moyen Euphrate", *CRAI* (1989) 535-561; J. Teixidor, "Deux documents syriaques du III<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.-C. provenant du moyen Euphrate", *CRAI* (1990) 146-166; S. Brock, "Some New Syriac Documents from the Third Century A.D.", *ARAM* 3 (1991) 259-267 provides a better reading and interpretation of the two Syriac legal documents.

epigraphical remains in the Edessene area from the first three centuries C.E. are exclusively pagan, whereas the literary legacy from that period is merely Christian. This situation calls for an explanation, for which simple alternatives—like pagan versus Christian, or Hellenistic versus local culture—are inadequate as approaches.

We know nothing about learning and education at Edessa in pre-Christian times. There must, however, have been schools and teachers at least for the upper class in society and for the merchants, since Edessa was an important city along the silk road to Asia and China. The first literary products written in Syriac and dating back to the second century C.E., point moreover to a longstanding literary tradition in the Edessene area, of which nothing is preserved.<sup>4</sup>

A school at Edessa, the so-called School of the Persians, is mentioned for the first time in connection with Ephrem Syrus, the Syrian church father, who moved from Nisibis to Edessa in 363 C.E., when Jovian ceded Nisibis to the Persians after the death of Julian the Apostate.<sup>5</sup> Barḥadbešabba, bishop of Ḥalwan in the beginning of the seventh century credits Ephrem with the founding of the School of the Persians.<sup>6</sup> But the church historian Sozomenos (*Hist. Eccl.* 3.16) does not mention Ephrem's founder's role, and Ephrem's biography makes his pupils into the founders of the School.<sup>7</sup> It is therefore unknown whether Ephrem or his pupils founded the School, or whether a school was already in existence. It is, however, clear from his writings that Ephrem taught at Edessa biblical exegesis as well as doctrinal matters and that he was in particular involved in polemics with heretics and gnostics and their adherents, such as Bardeśanites, Marcionites and Manichaeans. After Ephrem's death, and especially during the fifth century, the School was an important centre for the translation of Greek learning into Syriac, in particular of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Antiochene theologian

---

<sup>4</sup> The Epistle of Mara bar Serapion, W. Cureton (ed.), *Spicilegium Syriacum* 4 (London 1855) 43-48; 70-76; cf. F. Schulthess, "Der Brief des Mara bar Sarapion", *ZDMG* 51 (1897) 365-391; Oration of Meliton the Philosopher before Antoninus Caesar, W. Cureton (ed.), *Spicilegium Syriacum*, 22-35, 41-51.

<sup>5</sup> See E. Beck, "Ephraem Syrus", *RAC* 5, 520-531; R. Murray, "Ephraem Syrus", *TRE* 9, 755-762.

<sup>6</sup> Mar Barḥadbešabba 'Arbaya, *Cause de la fondation des écoles*, ed. A. Scher, PO IV/4, 381.

<sup>7</sup> Ephraem Syrus, *Hymni et Sermones*, ed. T.J. Lamy, I-IV (Mecchliniae 1882-1902) II, col.35; cf. A. Vööbus, *Literary Critical and Historical Studies in Ephrem the Syrian* (Stockholm 1958) 54f.

and biblical interpreter. The main works of Aristotle, the *Hermeneutics* and the *Organon*, and Porphyry's *Isagoge* into Aristotle's *Organon* were also translated from Greek into Syriac. These works provided the intellectual tools for Antiochene theology and christology. Many other Greek works, theological as well as philosophical, historical, geographical and astronomical, were translated into Syriac and functioned in the curriculum of the School.<sup>8</sup>

The problem of the exact founding period of the School of Edessa is closely linked with the different phases in which Greek learning became known in Syriac, especially at Edessa. The usual view is that, although there existed a bilingual Greco-Syriac culture during the early centuries of our Christian era of which very few remains have been preserved, early Syriac culture and early Syriac Christianity in particular was mainly untouched by Hellenism. This situation supposedly changed during the fifth and sixth centuries, when Syriac culture received a strong impact from Greek literature and philosophy, an impact that was to reach its climax during the seventh and eighth centuries.<sup>9</sup> In this perspective, the School of Edessa as a theological institution—where philosophical theology and philosophy were taught on the basis of elementary teaching followed by training in the *artes liberales*, especially literature and the Bible—came into existence after Ephrem's death and developed during the fifth century. It had no predecessor at Edessa, because the influence of Greek learning in an earlier period was rather limited and did not provide room for a school in the Hellenistic tradition.

In this paper I shall argue that Edessa, at least from the second half of the second century C.E. on, and probably much earlier, had a school, where literature, rhetoric, and philosophy were taught, as at Alexandria. It might not have been an actual institution, as in Alexandria,<sup>10</sup> but it certainly had a place where teachers and pupils gathered, just as in earlier periods in Athens, and later in Antioch. I would suggest a place near the Makam Ibrahim, the pool of Abraham, at the foot of the citadel, where nowadays a *madrasha* is

---

<sup>8</sup> E.R. Hayes, *L'école d'Édesse* (Paris 1930) 144-172; W. Liebeschuetz, "Hochschule", *RAC* 15, 901-902; A. Vööbus, *History of the School of Nisibis*, CSCO 266, Subs. 26 (Louvain 1965) 7-32.

<sup>9</sup> See S. Brock, "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning", in: N.G. Garsoïan, T.F. Mathews, R.W. Thomson (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period* (Washington 1982) 17-34.

<sup>10</sup> Liebeschuetz, *Hochschule* (as in n.8) 898-900.

situated.<sup>11</sup> Even geographically centres of learning have a strong tradition. I argue therefore for continuity and gradual change in the character of the School of Edessa, which over the centuries became more and more Christianised, but even as a mainly theological institution preserved characteristics in its curriculum that belong to the Hellenistic *Schulbetrieb*. My arguments for this view are the following.

The first teacher of philosophy at Edessa known to us is Bardaiṣan, the Aramaic philosopher, who lived at the court of king Abgar VIII the Great (154-222 C.E.). He had a group of pupils, with whom he discussed philosophical topics, in particular cosmology, theology, matters of fate and free will, the predestination of the soul, and the relation between matter and spirit. Bardaiṣan was a philosopher in the tradition of Middle Platonism, whose doctrine shows a great similarity to the philosophy of his contemporary Alexander of Aphrodisias, whose works he apparently knew.<sup>12</sup> A dialogue between Bardaiṣan and an unknown astrologer Awida on fate and free will is a dialogue in the true Platonic tradition. It was written by Bardaiṣan's pupil Philippus, just as Plato wrote Socrates' dialogues, and it provides us with a trustworthy report of his master's philosophical views. Like Plato's Timaeus Bardaiṣan knows a highest deity, lord of all, who sends out his *logos* in order to create the visible cosmos out of the mixture of the primordial elements (*stoicheia*). A certain order exists in the cosmos: highest god, planets, matter, corresponding to spirit, soul, and body in man, and to free will, fate, and natural laws in the realm of ethics. Bardaiṣan consequently defends monotheism; there exists a gradual descent from pure immaterial spirit to matter, the lowest level in the cosmos, but the tension between spirit and matter, god and the world, is not solved by assuming the existence of two opposite deities. Bardaiṣan's *logos* corresponds with Plato's demiurge and does not embody negative qualities. The Christian tradition identified Bardaiṣan's *logos* with Jesus Christ, creator and saviour. At the creation of the world Christ brought order in the chaos and instructed man in right behaviour, the prevalence of good over unordered, chaotic evil. Through doing

---

<sup>11</sup> Vööbus, *History* (as in n.8) 9, referring to Bar Hebraeus, *Chron. eccl.* II, col. 54f.; cf. J.B. Segal, *Edessa 'the Blessed City'* (Oxford 1970) 26 and n.4.

<sup>12</sup> See A. Dihle, "Zur Schicksalslehre des Bardesanes", in: *Kerygma und Logos*, Festschrift für C. Andresen (Göttingen 1979) 123-135.

good and following Christ's instructions the human soul will return after death to its divine origin. Bardaisan therefore maintained the unity of creation and salvation; from the beginning a salutary principle is at work in the world and in man, restoring order and harmony. This basically middle-Platonic doctrine can be labelled Christian, insofar as the active noetic principle, the *logos*, the Word of God's thought, is identified with Christ. It is, however, a timeless philosophical system, in which incarnation, passion, crucifixion and resurrection have no place.<sup>13</sup>

Bardaisan's doctrine has a clear formal resemblance to the thought of Tatian, the "Assyrian", who about 177 C.E. returned from Rome to the East. Tatian's Gospel Harmony, the *Diatessaron*, was probably originally written in Syriac, and was the current Gospel version at Edessa. Tatian's philosophical doctrine, which forms the underlying structure and formative principle of the *Diatessaron*, is to be found in his *Oratio ad Graecos*.<sup>14</sup> Again the *logos* plays a central role in the creation as well in the salvation process and again notions like incarnation, crucifixion and resurrection are absent; even the name Jesus does not occur. On the one hand the *Oratio* is a heavy attack on Greek philosophy and everything connected with it; on the other it presents a purely philosophical system, aiming at *homoiosis theoi* in the tradition of contemporary middle Platonism, and Tatian consequently ends his discourse by inviting the men of Greece to examine his doctrines. The *Oratio ad Graecos* seen from this angle is meant to be discussed in the school of the philosophers and presupposes all knowledge that is taught there.<sup>15</sup> Unlike Bardaisan, Tatian is an ascetic: taming the bodily passions is a necessary condition for living the life of the spirit and to make room for its indwelling. But again, asceticism is quite common in this period and many philosophers considered it a necessary requirement for the *vita philosophica*.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> H.J.W. Drijvers, *Bardaisan of Edessa*, Studia Semitica Neerlandica 6 (Assen 1966); idem, "Bardesanes", *TRE* 5, 206-212 (with bibliography).

<sup>14</sup> See H.J.W. Drijvers, G.J. Reinink, "Taufe und Licht. Tatian, Ebionäer-evangelium und Thomasakten", in: *Text and Testimony*, Essays in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn (Kampen 1988) 91-110, 98-107.

<sup>15</sup> M. Elze, *Tatian und seine Theologie* (Göttingen 1960).

<sup>16</sup> H.J.W. Drijvers, "East of Antioch. Forces and Structures in the Development of Early Syriac Theology", in: idem, *East of Antioch. Studies in Early Syriac Christianity* (London 1984) I, 7-9; Y. Tissot, "Encratisme et actes apocryphes", in: *Les actes apocryphes des apôtres. Christianisme et monde païen* (Genève 1981) 109-119.



Tatian had a formidable influence on the development of Christian thought in the Syriac area. The apocryphal Acts of Thomas, written probably at Edessa in the beginning of the third century in Syriac, basically proclaim Tatian's thoughts, which determine its ascetic enkratism as a requirement for rebirth and salvation. These Acts are not popular stories—*Volksliteratur*—but very sophisticated literature which cry out for learned interpretation. One can imagine that they were read and interpreted in the literature course of the liberal arts.<sup>17</sup>

There was much learned discussion at Edessa. Bardaisan's dialogue on Fate was, it is recorded, a polemic with the Marcionites, who were an important group at Edessa and probably formed the majority of the Christian community. Marcion was the first Christian theologian who interpreted the Christian message in the context of Platonic philosophy. He makes the God of the New Testament into Plato's highest unknown deity and the creator of the Old Testament into the demiurge, who has to do with evil matter. St Paul's contrast of law and grace, of Old and New Testament, of the Jews and the nations, is put forward as a Christian philosophy, in which again the main facts of Jesus' life do not play any role. Marcion's system of a highest god, a demiurge and matter, can be compared, for example with the philosophy of Numenius of Apamea, who called his second god Maker (*poietes*), who has a close bond with Matter, the third God. The same affective bond between the Demiurge and Matter we find in Albinus, for whom the Demiurge cannot exist without Matter, a concept that ultimately goes back to Plato's Timaeus 29A3 and 29E1.<sup>18</sup>

According to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* 4.30), Bardaisan's Dialogue on Fate was directed against the Marcionites. In view of the opening sentence of this dialogue, with which Awida starts the discussion, Eusebius' contention seems convincing:

If God is One, as you say he is, and he has created mankind intending you to do what you are charged to, why did he not create mankind in such wise that they could not sin, but always did what is right? Thereby his desire would have been fulfilled.

---

<sup>17</sup> See H.J.W. Drijvers, "The Acts of Thomas", in: W. Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* II, transl. by R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge 1992) 322-411, 322-338.

<sup>18</sup> See H.J.W. Drijvers, "Marcionism in Syria: Principles, Problems, Polemics", *The Second Century* 6 (1987-1988) 153-172, 161-164.

This is a well-defined definition of Marcionite problems, which led this sect to the belief in a just and imperfect creator next to the unknown good One. Bardaisan defended the existence of one God, at the same time good and creator of the world through the intermediary of His Word. Other powers of lower rank and restricted freedom are responsible for evil and deficiency in the world that is made from matter, which as a mixed substance embodies imperfection. Marcion on the other hand assumed the existence of two gods, the highest unknown one and the creator. Another testimony of the anti-Marcionite character of Bardaisan's dialogue is the use the redactor of the so-called *Grundschrift* of the Pseudo-Clementine writings made of it. The anti-Marcionite and very learned author of the *Grundschrift* made extensive use of Bardaisan's writings and philosophical views. The context in which he used these writings is a philosophical discussion on cosmological and astrological questions between St Peter, the apostle of orthodoxy, and Simon Magus, the arch heretic, who takes a Marcionite stand.<sup>19</sup>

Such discussions had already taken place among early Christians at Edessa at the end of the second and during the third century C.E.: is there one god or more (at least two) who is responsible for evil in the world; what is the relation between the spiritual world and the visible reality; what is the fate of the soul, and how can man reach the status of *homoiosis theoi*, his original paradisiac life? The conclusion is almost inevitable: early Syriac Christianity with its various groups was a learned, well-educated community in which serious philosophical discussions took place. We should take into account that bilingualism was a main characteristic of this community: their writings were in Syriac, which very soon or at the same time were translated into Greek, or Greek works were translated into Syriac.<sup>20</sup> According to Eusebius, Bardaisan's pupils—he had many, the church historian tells us—translated his works and dialogues into Greek. Tatian's *Diatessaron* was originally written in Syriac, but at Dura-Europos a Greek fragment of it turned up, so that this Gospel

---

<sup>19</sup> Drijvers, *Marcionism in Syria* (as in n.18) 154-155; idem, "Adam and the True Prophet in the Pseudo-Clementines", in: *Loyalitätskonflikte in der Religionsgeschichte*, Festschrift für Carsten Colpe (Würzburg 1990) 314-323.

<sup>20</sup> S. Brock, "Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac", in: idem, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (London 1984) IV, 80-82.

Harmony apparently was current in Greek too.<sup>21</sup> Language in this region was no cultural barrier; Syriac was as much Hellenised as Greek and as much a vehicle of Greek learning.

Bardaisan and Marcion are considered to be the teachers of Mani, born in Mesopotamia in 216 C.E., who founded a true gnostic church merely aiming at the salvation of the human soul through an austere asceticism. Despite its bewildering mythology, Manichaeism is a learned religious philosophy, which offers a rational explanation of all phenomena in the world:<sup>22</sup> that is why St Augustine was attracted to it. Mani was a prolific writer, who in his *Book of Mysteries* conducted an extensive polemic with Bardaisan on the soul, its making and fate, completely in the tradition of the many treatises *de anima* which were so common in Middle Platonism. Bardaisan is also reported to have written about the soul. Edessa had an important Manichaean group, to which Mani himself addressed a letter, which is partly preserved in Greek.<sup>23</sup>

It is hardly imaginable that second—and third-century Christianity at Edessa developed outside a school and a school tradition, where philosophical topics were discussed and written about. I believe that a substantial part of the Christian community of this town belonged to the educated higher echelons of society which took cognizance of current philosophical ideas and showed a distinct eclecticism. We are inclined to distinguish between various clearly labelled groups, such as Bardaisanites, Marcionites, and Manichaeans, with clearly different views, which indulged in weighty polemics and had in daily life very little to do with each other. Historical reality, if such a thing exists, cannot have been like that.

Greek learning, at least for a substantial part in Syriac disguise, must have been taught at Edessa long before we hear of that city's theological School. Christianity, which became known at Edessa sometime during the second century, became part of learning and teaching, another form of philosophy in different variations, worthy

---

<sup>21</sup> C.H. Kraeling, *A Greek Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron from Dura. Studies and Documents III* (London 1935); M.-E. Boismard, *Le Diatessaron: de Tatien à Justin* (Paris 1992) 83-91.

<sup>22</sup> H.H. Schaeder, "Urform und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems", *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg IV* (Leipzig 1927) 65-157; A. Böhlig, "Denkformen hellenistischer Philosophie im Manichäismus", *Perspektiven der Philosophie* 12 (1986) 11-39.

<sup>23</sup> Cologne Mani Codex 64.8-65.18; R. Cameron, A.J. Dewey, *The Cologne Mani Codex "Concerning the Origin of his Body"* (Chico 1979) 50-51.

to be discussed and written about. I assume that this situation remained more or less unchanged during the fourth century. When Ephrem Syrus came to Edessa, he found there Bardaisanites, Marcionites and Manichaeans, besides pagans, astrologers, soothsayers and, of course, Jews.<sup>24</sup> His own "orthodox" group, called Palutians, was only a tiny minority in comparison with the others. Ephrem was obliged to take part in the learned discussions which were going on and he wrote in the tradition of the Hellenistic school his *Prose Refutations* of Mani, Marcion and Bardaisan, in which we find meticulous and painstaking discussions of cosmology, the soul and its fate, free will and determinism etc.<sup>25</sup> In these learned treatises he specifically mentions Albinus and Hermes (Trismegistus), so that he at least must have had some knowledge of Greek learning.<sup>26</sup> We often miss the point of his sophisticated arguments, because we do not know the setting of these refutations, nor all the writings of Ephrem's opponents, but such is often the case in scholarship. Recent research has made clear that Ephrem Syrus was not such an isolated, purely Semitic, theologian as he was thought in the past. His biblical exegesis can be compared with methods in use in the School of Antioch, and he knew the strategics of Greek rhetoric.<sup>27</sup> In a sense, the personality and works of Ephrem Syrus distort the picture of Edessa as a centre of learning, where Greek learning was very common and Ephrem was obliged to defend the rights and views of a minority group which would develop into Edessene orthodoxy.

The oldest preserved Syriac manuscript written at Edessa—written probably in its school in 411 C.E.—gives an insight into the discussions which were going on. It contains a Syriac translation of the Pseudo-Clementine writings directed against the Marcionites,

<sup>24</sup> H.J.W. Drijvers, "Jews and Christians at Edessa", *JSS* 36 (1985) 88-102.

<sup>25</sup> C.W. Mitchell (ed.), *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*, 2 vols. (London 1912-1921).

<sup>26</sup> Mitchell, *Prose Refutations* (as in n.25) II, 7, line 9; II, 208-211 (Hermes Trismegistus); cf. H.J.W. Drijvers, "Bardaisan of Edessa and the Hermetica. The Aramaic Philosopher and the Philosophy of his Time", in: idem, *East of Antioch* (as in n.16) XI, 190-210; see also E. Beck, "Ephräms Rede gegen eine philosophische Schrift des Bardaisan", *OrChr* 60 (1976) 24-68; idem, *Ephräms des Syrers Psychologie und Erkenntnislehre*, CSCO, Subs. 58 (Louvain 1980).

<sup>27</sup> See S. Hidal, *Interpretatio Syriaca. Die Kommentare des heiligen Ephräm des Syrers zu Genesis und Exodus mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Auslegungsgeschichtlichen Stellung* (Lund 1974) passim and 139.

Titus of Bostra's learned and philosophical treatise against the Manichaeans, Eusebius' *Theophaneia* and his *Martyrs of Palestine*.<sup>28</sup> As is well-known Eusebius' *Theophaneia* contains a systematic exposition of his *Logos* doctrine. These works are indicative of the theological and philosophical interests in the School of Edessa and emphasise a continuity with the past, when the same topics were discussed. I infer that the School of Edessa was therefore receptive to the ideas of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Antiochene Interpreter, whose works were translated into Syriac in that same school. In Theodore's theology the eternal *Logos* occupies a central place, and Aristotle's philosophy is basic for its right understanding.<sup>29</sup>

Some tentative conclusions may now be offered. The School of Edessa was not founded by Ephrem Syrus, nor by his pupils, but was a long-standing institution dating back at least to the second century C.E., a period when more schools came into existence. Barḥadbešabba in his treatise on the founding of the schools makes a number of old testament figures, Jesus, various apostles and later persons of religious importance into founders of schools, including the legendary Addai, apostle of Edessa. In Barḥadbešabba's view Ephrem belongs in this category, because he is one of the bearers of divine wisdom in the course of history.<sup>30</sup> Barḥadbešabba's remark therefore does not refer to a founding of the School of Edessa in a certain period. Only after Ephrem's time and through his pupils did orthodoxy acquire a certain position in the school, but then only for a short period. The dominant role of Theodore's theology in the School caused the closing down of the latter in 489 C.E.<sup>31</sup>

The School of Edessa was a centre of Greek learning, where Greek philosophy and science was read, taught, and eventually translated into Syriac: Greek learning in Syriac disguise. The same holds true for Christian theology, which in its mainstream was as much Hellenised in its Syriac dress as in Greek. Local culture, at least in

---

<sup>28</sup> Brit.Lib. Add 12150; see I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Patrologia Syriaca* (Roma 1965, 2nd ed.) 230-232.

<sup>29</sup> See A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* I (Atlanta 1975) 421-439; H.J.W. Drijvers, "Early Forms of Antiochene Christology", in: *After Chalcedon. Studies in Theology and Church History offered to A. Van Roey* (Louvain 1985) 99-114; D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch. A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge 1982) 96-150.

<sup>30</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.6) 382, lines 9-11.

<sup>31</sup> See Vööbus, *History* (as in n.8) 30-32.

the upper layers of society, consisted of Greek learning. Again Ephrem Syrus' works distort the picture and have established the notion of a purely Semitic Christian learned idiom untouched by Hellenism; as such this never existed, except in the nostalgic dreams of some theologians longing for the original Christian belief shaped in a paradisiac language like Syriac.<sup>32</sup>

All this is an imaginative construct like all history, trying to fit the available evidence into a picture that makes sense of the intellectual past of Syriac Christianity. Syriac idiom was part of the rhetoric of empire, and the School of Edessa was consequently a centre of Greek learning adapted to a Semitic milieu.

---

<sup>32</sup> See S.H. Griffith, "Ephraem, the Deacon of Edessa, and the Church of the Empire", in: *Diakonia: Studies in Honor of Robert T. Meyer* (Washington 1986) 22-52; Bowersock, *Hellenism* (as in n.2) 33-34.



EX ORIENTE LUX





## EASTWARD AND WESTWARD TRANSMISSION OF CLASSICAL RHETORIC

JOHN W. WATT

In a volume concerned with, *inter alia*, the transmission of knowledge between the cultures epitomised by Alexandria, Baghdad, and Paris, a communication on classical rhetoric may appear to be in a somewhat anomalous position. Christian Walz's *Rhetores Graeci* (Stuttgart 1832-1836) and Karl Halm's *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Leipzig 1863) may not be the most frequently used volumes on the library shelves, but their presence there still assures us that classical rhetoric lived on in the Greek East and the Latin West. It is well known that Greek philosophy found enthusiastic admirers in the Syriac and Arabic East, but there is no series of '*Rhetores Syri et Arabici*' to set alongside 'Walz' and 'Halm'. Nevertheless, in this paper evidence will be presented which shows that rhetoric, like philosophy, continued to be studied in various forms in all three societies.

Greek culture made its impact on the Romans in Hellenistic and early Imperial times not primarily through translations, but directly through Greek or bilingual education. For several centuries, educated Romans were bilingual and received the equivalent of a Greek grammatical and rhetorical education, either in the Greek language alone, or in Greek and Latin.<sup>1</sup> Cicero, to be sure, translated part of the *Timaeus*, but Greek rhetorical theory was transmitted to the West by his own writings on the subject, not by translations. Therefore, by the time of Boethius, the greatest Latin translator of Greek in late antiquity, the Western world knew the substance of Hellenistic rhetorical theory through the works of Cicero and Quintilian. Boethius' philosophical writings show a close affinity to those of the contemporary Alexandrian Neoplatonists, but his discussion of rhetorical topics in *De differentiis topicis*, Book 4, is not based on contemporary Greek Neoplatonist rhetoricians, or even on Aristotle, but on Cicero.<sup>2</sup> Thus while Boethius made Aristotle's *Organon* known to

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H.I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité* (Paris 1965<sup>6</sup>) 356-388; I. Hadot, *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique* (Paris 1984) 44, 247-252.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J.J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley 1974) 68-71, 90-91;

the West, the Greek foundation of Western medieval rhetorical theory does not come from Victorinus or Boethius—although in *progymnasmata* Priscian's translation of Pseudo-Hermogenes was important—but from the bilingual culture of the Hellenistic and early Imperial period. "This discipline (*scil.* rhetoric) was invented by the Greeks, by Gorgias, Aristotle, and Hermagoras", wrote Isidore, "and translated into Latin by Cicero and Quintilian".<sup>3</sup>

Hunain and other Christian translators of the ninth and tenth centuries made Aristotle, Galen, and the *Republic* and *Laws* of Plato available to the Arabs, and thus did for them on a larger scale what Boethius had done for the Latin West. But whereas by Boethius' time Greek rhetoric had long been naturalised in Latin, the situation in Arabic was quite different. The literary patrimony of the 'Abbāsid Arabs owed nothing to Greek literature and rhetoric, and while Greek philosophy could be viewed by Arabic philosophers as a universal treasure, the same did not apply to Greek literature and rhetoric. Christianity arose in the Graeco-Roman world and rapidly adapted itself to classical culture, but the classical heritage was a later graft on to Arabic-Islamic culture. The grafting was astonishingly successful in philosophy and science, but there was no receptor for it in literature and rhetoric, for the Muslim Arabs were proud of their own language and generally did not know any Greek.<sup>4</sup>

In the sixth century, however, when the Syrians began to translate Greek philosophical and medical works, many Syrians knew Greek and had received a Greek education. In Mesopotamia the educated classes were evidently bilingual, and Syriac came to be increasingly employed by 'Greeks' even in western Syria.<sup>5</sup> Sergius of Reshaina, with many of his compatriots, was educated in Alexandria,<sup>6</sup> and it

---

M.C. Leff, "Boethius' *De differentiis topicis*, Book IV", in: J.J. Murphy (ed.), *Medieval Eloquence* (Berkeley 1978) 3-24; E. Stump, *Boethius's De Topicis Differentiis* (Ithaca 1978) esp. 141-155. Victorinus, too, took Cicero as his prime source for rhetoric; cf. P. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus* (Paris 1971) 73-101, and J.O. Ward, "From Antiquity to the Renaissance: Glosses and Commentaries on Cicero's *Rhetorica*", in: Murphy, *Medieval Eloquence* (as above) 43-44.

<sup>3</sup> Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* 2.2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. R. Walzer, "L'éveil de la philosophie islamique", *Revue des études islamiques* 38 (1970) 23-27.

<sup>5</sup> Probus, for example, was a physician of Antioch. Cf. S. Brock, "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning", in: N.G. Garsoian, T.F. Mathews, R.W. Thomson (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period* (Washington D.C. 1982) 26.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *ibidem* 21.

is hard to believe that they had not received a prior Greek grammatical and rhetorical education in Syria or Mesopotamia, since pagan and Christian Neoplatonists were generally agreed that these studies were a necessary *propaideia* to philosophy.<sup>7</sup> In the sixth century, people came from lands under Persian control to Edessa to learn Greek, and the prestige of Greek letters and wisdom in Mesopotamia was clearly very great.<sup>8</sup> The situation of the Syrians in relation to Greek culture in late antiquity was therefore more comparable to that of the Romans in Hellenistic and early Imperial times than to that of the Arabs in the ninth century, or indeed to the West at the time of Boethius. Thus there is every reason to suppose that Greek literature and rhetoric were studied by philhellenes of Syria and Mesopotamia just as much as Greek grammar, philosophy, and medicine. Of course, not all Syrians were philhellenes; Ephraim was not, but at least from the time of Bardaisan many clearly were.<sup>9</sup>

We know of no Syriac translations of Greek works of rhetorical theory other than the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle, nor of any original works on the subject in Syriac before the *Rhetoric* of Antony of Tagrit, an extensive treatise (in five Books) probably composed in the ninth century.<sup>10</sup> However, there is nothing in this treatise relating to rhetorical theory which need be later than the sixth century (or perhaps somewhat earlier). Its Greek inspiration is quite evident, and on occasion is alluded to by the author himself.<sup>11</sup> Some striking points of contact between Antony and Greek rhetors may be noted. Antony divides rhetoric into three species (corresponding to judicial, deliberative, and epideictic), and connects each of them with one of the three Platonic parts of the soul (rational, passionate, and appetitive). The tripartition of rhetoric is common from Aristotle onwards,<sup>12</sup> but its linkage with the tripartition of the soul first appears in the commentators to Aphthonius-Hermogenes (in combinations

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Hadot, *Arts libéraux* (as in n.1) 270-282.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Brock, *From Antagonism to Assimilation* (as in n.5) 21-22.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J.W. Watt, "Grammar, Rhetoric, and the Enkyklios Paideia in Syriac", *ZDMG* 143 (1993) 45-71, and the article of H.J.W. Drijvers in the present volume.

<sup>10</sup> On the dating, cf. J.W. Watt, *The Fifth Book of the Rhetoric of Antony of Tagrit*, CSCO 481 (Louvain 1986) v-x, and H.J.W. Drijvers, "Antony of Tagrit's Book On the Good Providence of God", in: R. Lavenant (ed.), *V Symposium Syriacum 1988*, OrChrA 236 (Rome 1990) 163-166.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Watt, *The Fifth Book of the Rhetoric* (as in n.10) 5-7.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. F. Solmsen, "The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric", *American Journal of Philology* 62 (1941) 42-43, 180-181.

different from that found in Antony).<sup>13</sup> His definition of rhetoric (“A faculty of persuasive speech, possessing proper sequence, on any matter about which it may become vehement, either theoretical or practical, having the power to prevail over the multitude and bring the crowd to obedience and belief in what is said”) reminds us both of the ‘standard’ definition of later Greek rhetorical theory attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (“An artistic faculty of persuasive speech on a political matter, having as its aim to speak well”),<sup>14</sup> and of the distinction drawn between dialectic (question and answer) and rhetoric (continuous speech) in Hellenistic times.<sup>15</sup> His epideictic theory of the divisions of a human encomium recalls the standard rhetorical schema of soul-body-fortune and the four cardinal virtues,<sup>16</sup> while his prescription for the disposition of an encomium (native city, family, occupation, upbringing, actions, bodily endowments, fortune, comparison) clearly falls within the same pattern as that of the *progymnasmata* and Menander Rhetor.<sup>17</sup> Even his instructions for the praise of a city are close to the classical authorities.<sup>18</sup> He is familiar in general terms with stasis theory and the theory of topics, although neither is very elaborately developed in his treatise. He does, however, write at some length about the tripartite system of subject matter, disposition, and ornamentation, the Aristotelian triad (Arist., *Rhet.* 3.1) with the common late Greek monopolisation of style by ornamentation.<sup>19</sup> He devotes the fifth and final book of his treatise to ornamentation, which he divides into metres, figures, and assonance.<sup>20</sup> His account of figures, although greatly simpler than the Greek and Latin accounts, is nonetheless clearly related to them, and also to the simple exercises of the *progymnasmata*, such as fable, chreia, and personification.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Cf. H. Rabe, *Prolegomenon Sylloge*, *Rhetores Graeci* XIV (Leipzig 1931) index s.v. ῥητορικὴ (δικανικόν, συμβουλευτικόν, πανηγυρικόν), ψυχή.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *ibidem* 30.12f.; 283.14f.; etc.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. P. Hadot, “Philosophie, dialectique, rhétorique dans l’antiquité”, *Studia Philosophica* 39 (1980) 139-166, esp. 154-157.

<sup>16</sup> There is, however, a significant modification of it in Antony’s treatise; cf. below 72.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. D.A. Russell, N. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford 1981) xix-xxxi.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *ibidem* xxiv, xxix.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Solmsen, *The Aristotelian Tradition* (as in n.12) 38, 43-44, 181-183.

<sup>20</sup> Compare the old Peripatetic division of the *ornatus* (κόσμος) by composition (σύνθεσις), figures (σχήματα), and word-selection (ἐκλογή). Cf. Solmsen, *ibidem* 43-44.

<sup>21</sup> I have given more details of Antony’s treatment of all these points in the

This work of medieval Syriac rhetoric holds to its classical and Greek roots in another important respect, in that it preserves to a certain extent the relationship of rhetoric to the teaching of the *grammatikos* and the study of literary classics. Antony devotes a chapter to the value of (technical) grammar for rhetoric, and another to the value of poetry, telling us moreover that some rendered Greek verse compositions into Syriac for rhetorical reading (*l-qrynʿ rhytryʿ*). Antony's favourite quarry is Homer;<sup>22</sup> that would be no cause for surprise in a Greek rhetor, but is rather significant for a Syriac one. It is clear, therefore, that something resembling the traditional Greek grammatical education persisted in the Syriac Near East, i.e., not just technical grammar, but also literature, even although the pagan literature studied was no doubt drastically reduced and the Christian classics, especially Gregory of Nazianzus, were probably held in higher esteem.<sup>23</sup> The study of rhetoric was presumably continuous with this 'grammatical' study. We may assume that for a considerable period this education was bilingual, but in time the knowledge of Greek declined. I suspect that Antony knew no more Greek than Augustine, and possibly knew none at all. He himself did not transmit Greek rhetorical theory to the Syriac East, but his treatise opens for us a window into what had been transmitted in the previous centuries, and for Bar Shakko and Bar Hebraeus in the thirteenth century it represented the standard Syriac book on the subject.<sup>24</sup>

The influence of rhetoric on medieval Western and Byzantine literature is too vast a subject to qualify for more than a passing mention here, but it may be worth noting that the less well known transfer of Greek rhetorical lore to the Syrian Near East also made a corresponding impact in some areas of Syriac literature. The application of deliberative rhetoric has been detected in the *Liber Graduum*,<sup>25</sup>

---

following: "Syriac Rhetorical Theory and the Syriac Tradition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*", in: W.W. Fortenbaugh, D.C. Mirhady (eds.), *Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities* 6 (New Brunswick 1994) 243-260; "The Syriac Reception of Platonic and Aristotelian Rhetoric", *ARAM*, forthcoming; "Syriac Panegyric in Theory and Practice. Antony of Tagrit and Eli of Qartamin", *Le Muséon* 102 (1989) 271-298; "Antony of Tagrit on Rhetorical Figures", in: H.J.W. Drijvers et al. (eds.), *IV Symposium Syriacum 1984*, OrChrA 229 (Rome 1987) 317-325.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. H. Raguse, "Syrische Homerzitate in der Rhetorik des Anton von Tagrit", in: *Paul de Lagarde und die syrische Kirchengeschichte* (Göttingen 1968) 162-175.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. my *Grammar, Rhetoric, and the Enkyklios Paideia in Syriac* (as in n.9) 58-64.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *ibidem* 49-55, 64-68.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. A. Böhlig, "Zur Rhetorik im *Liber Graduum*", in: Drijvers et al. (eds.), *IV Symposium Syriacum* (as in n.21) 297-305.

forensic rhetoric in the work of Narsai,<sup>26</sup> rhetorical figures in the *Gannat Bussāmē*,<sup>27</sup> and epideictic rhetoric in some Syriac panegyrics.<sup>28</sup> It has been explained above why the situation of the Syrians with regard to Greek rhetoric and literature in late antiquity and the early Islamic period differed from that of the Arabs in the ninth and tenth centuries, but it should now be pointed out that in Arabic literature also, traces of Greek rhetorical influence have been found. The best known instance, the elucidation by von Grunebaum of Greek form elements in the Arabian Nights, may be considered more literary than rhetorical,<sup>29</sup> but the same scholar also observed the agreement of al-Ḥarīrī's *maqāma* in praise of Basra with the rules for the praise of cities in Menander Rhetor.<sup>30</sup> The use of classical rhetorical figures has been noted in a work of a quite different genre, the Arabic version of Aetius by the Christian translator Qusṭā b. Lūqā.<sup>31</sup> Its editor, Hans Daiber, while not excluding direct contacts between Byzantium and the Arab world, considers that the knowledge of Greek rhetoric revealed by these and other examples may have been transmitted through Syriac schools.<sup>32</sup>

Rhetoric impinges not only on grammar and literature, but also on philosophy, particularly dialectic and political philosophy. Both Plato and Aristotle discussed the relationship of rhetoric to dialectic (although by dialectic they did not mean exactly the same thing), and the Stoics regarded them as the two divisions of logic, the former proceeding by continuous speech, the latter by question and answer.<sup>33</sup> Greek rhetorical theory was dominated in Hellenistic times by stasis theory and orientated above all towards judicial rhetoric,

---

<sup>26</sup> Cf. K. McVey, "The Memra of Narsai on the three Nestorian Doctors as an Example of Forensic Rhetoric", in: R. Lavenant (ed.), *III Symposium Syriacum 1980*, OrChrA 221 (Rome 1983) 87-96.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. G.J. Reinink, "Rhetorik in der Homilie zu Jes. 52,13-53,12 des Katholikos Mar Abba II von Kaškar", in: Drijvers et al. (eds.), *IV Symposium Syriacum* (as in n.21) 307-316.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Watt, *Syriac Panegyric in Theory and Practice* (as in n.21) 285-298.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. G.E. von Grunebaum, "Greek Form Elements in the Arabian Nights", *JAOS* 62 (1942) 277-292.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. idem, "Observations on City Panegyrics in Arabic Prose", *JAOS* 64 (1944) 61-65. As noted above 66, rules for praising cities were known to Antony of Tagrit.

<sup>31</sup> H. Daiber, *Aetius Arabus. Die Vorsokratiker in arabischer Überlieferung* (Wiesbaden 1980) 61-68.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. ibidem 70-72.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. above, n.15.

a trend which continued to the end of Byzantium. Philosophical interest in this emerges in late antiquity with Porphyry, who apparently wrote a commentary on Minucianus. For the later Neoplatonists and the Byzantines, the authority on stasis theory was Hermogenes, and commentaries on Hermogenes played an analogous role in rhetoric to those on Aristotle in philosophy. While stasis theory may have had some practical application in the courts of state and church, its teachers and theorists seem to have been more interested in its educational value, principally as a *propaideia* to philosophy. They held to the definition of Dionysius of Halicarnassus of rhetoric as “an artistic faculty of persuasive speech” ἐν πράγματι πολιτικῷ, but the public questions they discussed were the traditional ones of declamation, not those of contemporary public life.<sup>34</sup>

Stasis theory was known in the West principally from Cicero and Quintilian, rather than the later Greek developments in Minucianus or Hermogenes. There are indications in Fortunatianus, Julius Victor, and Sulpicius Victor of a separate, non-Ciceronian Greek tradition,<sup>35</sup> but these minor Latin rhetors had a limited readership, and even for Victorinus and Boethius, the two great translators from Greek, the basis for the understanding of technical rhetoric remained Cicero’s *De inventione*.<sup>36</sup> In the West, however, we observe, in some ways to an even greater degree, the subordination of rhetorical theory to dialectic which we have just noted for the Greek East. Boethius’ work on rhetorical topics was highly influential in the later Middle Ages. Like the Greek technical writers, in principle he limited rhetoric to civic questions, but these were confined to judicial rhetoric in abstraction from legal practice.<sup>37</sup> On the subject of dialectical topics, Boethius drew not only from Cicero, but also from the Greek philosopher-orator Themistius.<sup>38</sup> Like Cicero,

---

<sup>34</sup> There is an accessible account of late antique Neoplatonic rhetorical theory in G.A. Kennedy, “Later Greek Philosophy and Rhetoric”, *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 13 (1980) 181-197; idem, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton 1983) 73-122. Cf. also G.L. Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric* (Thessaloniki 1973) 5-26.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. A. Reuter, “Untersuchungen zu den römischen Technographen Fortunatian, Julius Victor, Capella und Sulpitius Victor”, *Hermes* 28 (1893) 73-134, esp. the summary on 133; J. Monfasani, *George of Trebizond* (Leiden 1976) 251, n.32.

<sup>36</sup> On the readership of the minor Latin rhetors, cf. Monfasani, *George of Trebizond* (as in n.35) 251, n.33. On the small influence of the later Greek stasis tradition on Victorinus, cf. Hadot, *Marius Victorinus* (as in n.2) 78.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Leff, *Boethius’ De differentiis topicis* (as in n.2) 15-24.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. ibidem 6-9; Stump, *Boethius’ De Topicis Differentiis* (as in n.2) 43-78.



Themistius held that oratory and philosophy should be applied beneficially to public life, and we might therefore reasonably assume that he believed his commentary on Aristotle's *Topics* to be of value to the orator-statesman. He also attacked sophists (cf. Plato) and was opposed to those who had studied philosophy becoming rhetors (i.e., advocates) in the law-courts.<sup>39</sup> Neither Western rhetoricians nor Greek commentators on Hermogenes showed much interest in the value of philosophical rhetoric for the statesman. In Byzantium, however, beside the interest in Hermogenes, the sophistic and political aspects of rhetoric were much stronger than in the West; but for the most remarkable continuation of the Platonic political rhetoric found in Themistius, we have to look further east.

Antony of Tagrit was familiar with the basic notions of classical and Hellenistic theory on the relation of rhetoric to dialectic, and also with the three *stases* of fact, definition or quality, and transfer of blame.<sup>40</sup> However, unlike most post-Porphyrian Greek writing on rhetorical theory, his treatise is not a commentary on an earlier rhetorician such as Minucianus or Hermogenes. His co-ordination of the three species of rhetoric with the tripartition of the soul is a striking point of contact with the commentators on Aphthonius-Hermogenes, which shows that the Syriac rhetorical tradition did indeed draw from the same reservoir of late antique theory as the Greek commentators.<sup>41</sup> The two traditions, however, ran off in quite different channels. For the Neoplatonic Greek tradition, the subject is propaedeutic to philosophy, "the audience really does not exist, [and] the speech is not intended for practical persuasive effect".<sup>42</sup> For Antony, by contrast, the speaker should be a philosopher, the audience is the unphilosophical multitude, and the speech of a statesman is intended to persuade them towards the Good. Rhetoric here performs its traditional function in (non-Plotinian) Platonism as a tool of the philosopher-statesman which "persuades to justice and thus helps to govern events in states"

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. G. Downey, "Education and Public Problems as seen by Themistius", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 86 (1955) 297-298; Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (as in n.34) 32-35; Hadot, *Arts libéraux* (as in n.1) 91.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. my *Syriac Rhetorical Theory* (as in n.21) 249-252.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. my *The Syriac Reception of Platonic and Aristotelian Rhetoric* (as in n.21).

<sup>42</sup> Kennedy, *Later Greek Philosophy and Rhetoric* (as in n.34) 192.

(Plato, *Pol.* 304a), and enables the ruler and legislator to achieve his ends by persuasion (πειθῶ) rather than force (βία).<sup>43</sup>

It is well known that Plotinus, Porphyry, Proclus and their successors had little interest in Plato's political philosophy, and it is therefore scarcely surprising that their disciples among the rhetoricians emphasised the dialectical aspects of rhetoric at the expense of the political. But in some other circles in late antiquity, Plato's political philosophy continued to enjoy the high regard of public orators, pagan and Christian. Among the former we may mention Julian and Themistius, among the latter Synesius of Cyrene.<sup>44</sup> Themistius' orations are a powerful expression of the Platonic ideal of the philosopher-king and of the public importance of philosophy and eloquence.<sup>45</sup> His political thought was influential in Byzantium, and quite possibly also further east, for we know Syriac versions of two of his orations and a (Syro-)Arabic version of his letter to Julian.<sup>46</sup> While the philosophical dimension of kingship was not ignored by some later Greek orators,<sup>47</sup> other features—such as the emperor's divine origin, righteousness, embodiment of law (νόμος ἐμψυχος), and philanthropia—are more prominent in the prooemia to the Byzantine imperial *novellae*, in which one senses the application of rhetoric in the service of the state and also the abiding influence of the prooemia of Plato's *Laws*.<sup>48</sup>

As one goes further east, however, the philosophical and Platonic element in the kingly ideal comes back into greater prominence. In the case of the Syrians, this statement may seem surprising, for it has long been assumed that their 'serious' philosophical interest was

---

<sup>43</sup> For Plato himself, cf. e.g. G.R. Morrow, "Plato's Conception of Persuasion", *Philosophical Review* 62 (1953) 234-250, and H. Görgemanns, *Beiträge zur Interpretation von Platons Nomoi* (Munich 1960) 49-71 and passim. For later Platonism, cf. e.g. H. Schneider, *Die 34. Rede des Themistios* (Winterthur 1966) 74-75, 126. On the witness of Cicero, cf. Hadot, *Arts libéraux* (as in n.1) 44-52, who, however, (ibidem and 76-77, 89) can see in this 'New Academic-Middle Platonic' attitude to rhetoric only a radical reinterpretation of Plato's thought, which hardly does justice to Plato's views on a philosophical rhetoric.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. F. Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy* (Washington D.C. 1966) 622-705.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (as in n.34) 32-35.

<sup>46</sup> E. Sachau, *Inedita Syriaca* (Vienna 1870) 17-75; *Themistii Orationes*, vol. 3 (Leipzig 1974) 7-119.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. K. Praechter, "Antikes in der Grabrede des Georgios Akropolites auf Johannes Dukas", *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 14 (1905) 479-491.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. H. Hunger, *Prooimion. Elemente der byzantinischen Kaiseridee in den Arengen der Urkunden* (Vienna 1964) 19-35, 49-155.

confined to Aristotle, and works attributed to Plato in Syriac are limited to a few spurious dialogues and definitions.<sup>49</sup> The evidence for it lies in the *Rhetoric* of Antony of Tagrit. In this treatise, the usual prescriptions for an imperial oration (*basilikos logos*) are modified—in a way which to the best of my knowledge has no direct parallel among extant Greek rhetors—to highlight the Platonic ideal of the union of political power and philosophy (Plato, *Resp.* 5. 473cd). Courage, righteousness, and temperance, three of the four cardinal virtues, are transferred from the heading of ‘goods of the soul’ to a new heading of ‘goods of soul and body’, and the new ‘goods of the soul’ [i.e., wisdom, σοφία/φρόνησις] are philosophy, philanthropia, and statesmanly and domestic actions.<sup>50</sup> Antony’s specimen encomium reveals this ideal king to be in possession of the moral and intellectual attributes of Plato’s guardians (Plato, *Resp.* 6. 485a-487a) and ideal ruler (Plato, *Leg.* 4. 709e-718c), and also to be a philosopher trained in the sciences of Alexandrian Neoplatonism—with the important addition that he has an eloquent and poetic tongue and hence in his political activity “encourages, leads, persuades, and turns his subjects towards the Good.”<sup>51</sup>

It therefore seems that the old political, legislative, and religious functions of rhetoric, especially of Plato’s philosophical rhetoric which required a knowledge of the soul in addition to dialectic (cf. Plato, *Phdr.* 259e-277c),<sup>52</sup> were important in maintaining the interest in the discipline among the Syrians, and presumably also in the circles in Greek late antiquity from which they derived it. That this interest of the Syrians is no mirage produced by exaggerating the importance of Antony’s *Rhetoric* is confirmed by the emergence of these matters into a clearer light in the writings of al-Fārābī, to whom Arabic philosophy owes the naturalisation of the doctrine of the philosopher-king. Al-Fārābī received his instruction in philosophy from Christian Syrians, and depended on Arabic translations made by them from Greek and Syriac. Conversely, among the

<sup>49</sup> Sachau, *Inedita Syriaca* (as in n.46) 66-70.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. J.W. Watt, “The Philosopher-King in the *Rhetoric* of Antony of Tagrit”, in: R. Lavenant (ed.), *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992*, OrChrA 247 (Rome 1994) 245-258.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. ibidem 249; Watt, *The Syriac Reception of Platonic and Aristotelian Rhetoric* (as in n.21).

<sup>52</sup> No doubt it was this section of the *Phaedrus* which inspired the rhetors of late antiquity to link the tripartition of rhetoric to the tripartition of the soul. Cf. above, n.13.

Syrians he found pupils and attentive readers of his own works.<sup>53</sup> In his writings on *The Attainment of Happiness* and *The Perfect State*, the philosopher-king is required not only to have the moral and intellectual attributes of the guardians of Plato's *Republic*, but also to be a fine orator,<sup>54</sup> an attribute which, as Walzer noted, is probably to be derived ultimately from the *Phaedrus*, *Cleitophon*, and the prooemia of the *Laws*.<sup>55</sup>

There is little doubt as to where al-Fārābī expected his philosopher-king to turn in order to learn the details of this art: not Hermogenes or his commentators, but the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle. In his *Philosophy of Aristotle*, after dealing with logic with reference to the six books later designated in the West as the *Organon*, al-Fārābī explained that Aristotle then

gave an account of the art that enables man to persuade the multitude regarding all the theoretical things and those practical things in which it is customary to confine oneself to using persuasive arguments drawn from men's activities when conducting their public business—that is, the activities through which they labour together toward the end for the sake of which man is made.<sup>56</sup>

In this (and the following) section he is clearly interpreting the *Rhetoric* (and the *Poetics*) within the Alexandrian scheme of the study of Aristotle, leading from the extended *Organon* (i.e., the six books of the Western *Organon* plus the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*) to physics and metaphysics. As is well known, the Alexandrians understood the arrangement of the eight-book *Organon* in the light of the theory of the five types of syllogism.<sup>57</sup> For them, and presumably for their rhetorical counterparts, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was not about rhetoric—Hermogenes was the authority on that<sup>58</sup>—but about the 'protection'

---

<sup>53</sup> Cf. F. Rosenthal, R. Walzer, *Alfarabius, De Platonis philosophia*, Plato Arabus II (London 1943) xvi-xviii; R. Walzer, *Al-Fārābī On the Perfect State* (Oxford 1985) 22-25.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. M. Mahdi, *Alfarabi's Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle* (Ithaca 1969) 37-39, 44-47, also 62, 66-67 (on which cf. Rosenthal and Walzer, *Alfarabius, De Platonis philosophia* [as in n.53] 23, 27-28); R. Walzer, *Al-Fārābī On the Perfect State* (as in n.53) 246-249, 445-446.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. R. Walzer, "Aspects of Islamic Political Thought: Al-Fārābī and Ibn Xaldūn", *Oriens* 16 (1963) 48-49.

<sup>56</sup> Mahdi, *Alfarabi's Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle* (as in n.54) 92.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. R. Walzer, "Zur Traditionsgeschichte der aristotelischen Poetik", repr. in: idem, *Greek into Arabic* (Oxford 1962) 129-136; P. Moraux, *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain 1951) 177-183.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Olympiodorus, *Prolegomena et In Categorias commentarium*, A. Busse (ed.),

of the apodeictic syllogism.<sup>59</sup> Al-Fārābī reproduces this theory in his *Catalogue of the Sciences*,<sup>60</sup> and in his commentary on the *Rhetoric* (*Kitāb al-Khaṭāba*) he is certainly very concerned with the logical status of rhetorical discourse and the rhetorical syllogism, but rhetoric for him is the means to instruct the multitude and is for use in public business.<sup>61</sup>

If al-Fārābī learned in general about the political function of philosophical rhetoric from the Syrians, it is highly probable that he derived from them also this interpretation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. The discovery that Paul the Persian knew the theory of the five types of syllogism has increased the likelihood that the 'sylogistic' interpretation of the *Rhetoric* reached al-Fārābī through the Syrians;<sup>62</sup> Antony of Tagrit's *Rhetoric* does the same for the 'political' interpretation. When Antony in his model encomium describes the scientific excellencies of his ideal ruler, he proceeds from dialectic to apodeictic, rhetoric, poetics, mathematics, and physics. While this sequence is not quite identical to that of the Alexandrians and al-Fārābī, it is still close enough for us to believe that it is related to the study of Aristotle's writings.<sup>63</sup> Among some Syrians, at least, it therefore seems that Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was not just interpreted as a treatise designed to 'protect' the apodeictic syllogism, but to teach the art of persuasive eloquence—specifically for the philosopher-king, to persuade the multitude towards the Good.

Al-Fārābī required the future philosopher-king to be brought up generally in the manner stipulated by Plato in the *Republic*. There is, however, an important difference. The old Greek training in gymnastics, music, and poetry (literature) taken over by Plato as propaedeutic to philosophy is replaced by an upbringing in the laws and customs of the particular religion of the ruler.<sup>64</sup> In other words,

---

*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* 12.1 (Berlin 1902) 18.7-10, cited in translation by D. Gutas, "Paul the Persian on the classification of the parts of Aristotle's philosophy: a milestone between Alexandria and Baghdad", *Der Islam* 60 (1983) 258. Interestingly, while Hermogenes is regarded as the authority on rhetoric, Aristotle is considered the authority on poetics.

<sup>59</sup> For the various terms used to describe the function of the third part of logic, i.e., the non-demonstrative part, cf. Gutas, *Paul the Persian* (as in n.58) 242, n.24.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Walzer, *Zur Traditionsgeschichte* (as in n.57) passim.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. J. Langhade, M. Grignaschi, *Deux ouvrages inédits sur la rhétorique* (Beirut 1971) 56.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Gutas, *Paul the Persian* (as in n.58) 257, n.64, and passim.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. my *The Syriac Reception of Platonic and Aristotelian Rhetoric* (as in n.21).

<sup>64</sup> Mahdi, *Alfarabi's Philosophy of Plato and Aristotle* (as in n.54) 48. Cf. Walzer, *Al-Fārābī On the Perfect State* (as in n.53) 444-445.

in al-Fārābī's scheme the Islamic 'classics' replace the 'classics' of the literary, pre-philosophical education generally known in the Greek world as the *enkyklios paideia*. This literary ('grammatical') education, which had survived the transition from paganism to Christianity and even to a certain extent the transition from Greek to Syriac, finds no place in the Muslim philosopher's form of the perfect state. With this, classical rhetoric, which had a foot in both the literary and the philosophical camps, is cut off from the former and completely integrated into the latter, and thus is no longer visible as a discipline in its own right. While in Syriac, in the *Rhetoric* of Antony of Tagrit, classical rhetoric with its connections both to classical literature and philosophy is still recognisable, in Islam it is absorbed into philosophy and is focused exclusively on the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle.

The first sign of any real interest in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in Byzantium only appears in the tenth century (the century of al-Fārābī), when the oldest extant Greek manuscript of the work was written, *Parisinus graecus 1741*.<sup>65</sup> It is an interesting speculation that the exemplar of the *Rhetoric* of this manuscript may have come from a collection in Syro-Arabic territory.<sup>66</sup> The *Rhetoric* was re-introduced into the West in the thirteenth century, where apparently many regarded it as a work on ethics or politics.<sup>67</sup> It seems possible that the Arabic understanding of its political potential<sup>68</sup> may have contributed to this appreciation of it in the West; interest there in the Arabic interpreters is indicated, among other things, by the fact that parts of al-Fārābī's commentary were made available in Latin by Hermannus Alemannus, as early as the translation of the *Rhetoric* itself.<sup>69</sup> Thus, like the study of different aspects of classical rhetoric in general, Aristotle's treatise on the subject eventually found application in diverse ways in pre-modern times in the Syro-Arabic Orient, the Greek East, and the Latin West.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. D. Harlfinger, D. Reinsch, "Die Aristotelica des Parisinus graecus 1741", *Philologus* 114 (1970) 28-50.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. T.M. Conley, "Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in Byzantium", *Rhetorica* 8 (1990) 34-38.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (as in n.2) 92-101.

<sup>68</sup> Al-Fārābī's appreciation of the political import of the *Rhetoric* was taken up by later Muslim philosophers, especially Averroes. Cf. C.E. Butterworth, "The Rhetorician and his Relationship to the Community. Three Accounts of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*", in: M.E. Marmura (ed.), *Islamic Theology and Philosophy* (New York 1984) 111-136.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. W.F. Boggess, "Hermannus Alemannus's Rhetorical Translations", *Viator* 2 (1971) 227-250; Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (as in n.2) 90-92.



# ‘EDESSA GREW DIM AND NISIBIS SHONE FORTH’: THE SCHOOL OF NISIBIS AT THE TRANSITION OF THE SIXTH-SEVENTH CENTURY

G.J. REININK

‘Edessa grew dim and Nisibis shone forth’. In this metaphor, a teacher or alumnus of the School of Nisibis<sup>1</sup> at the end of the sixth century expressed the opinion of his community that this famous institution in the Persian Empire had taken over the torch of the true and orthodox teaching of the School of Edessa, after the Byzantine Empire had fallen into theological error in the fifth century.<sup>2</sup> At the time these words were spoken, the School of Nisibis had attained the pinnacle of its fame and success as the ‘centre of learning’ *par excellence* of the East Syrian, Persian church. Many teachers active in theological, philosophical and secular disciplines were connected with it,<sup>3</sup> and the flow of students from the most varied locations within and beyond the Sassanid Empire had never been so great.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The most comprehensive study of the School of Nisibis is the *History of the School of Nisibis* by A. Vööbus, CSCO 266, Subs. 26 (Louvain 1965). For the older works, see Vööbus’ bibliography, and, in addition, J.-M. Fiey, *Nisibe, métropole syriaque orientale et ses suffragants des origines à nos jours*, CSCO 388, Subs. 54 (Louvain 1977) 16, n.3.

<sup>2</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause de la fondation des écoles*, ed. A. Scher, PO IV/4, 386, ll. 9-10/11-13 (see further below, notes 13, 15, 16). For the ‘School of the Persians’ in Edessa, see E.R. Hayes, *L’école d’Édesse* (Paris 1930) 144-158 and passim; J.B. Segal, *Edessa: ‘The Blessed City’* (Oxford 1970) 150; Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 7-24. For the christological controversies in the fifth century leading to the expulsion of the diophysites from Edessa, the closing of the ‘School of the Persians’ by the emperor Zeno (in 489) and the founding of the School of Nisibis, see Vööbus, *op.cit.*, 24-56; S. Gero, *Baršaumā of Nisibis and Persian Christianity in the Fifth Century*, CSCO 426, Subs. 63 (Louvain 1981).

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of the different teaching functions, the curriculum and the organization of the School, see Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 90-115, 143-148, 271-275, 282-289. Medical studies may have been introduced in the first half of the sixth century under the directorate of Abraham of Bet Rabban, who founded the *xenodocheion* of the School; see also below, note 35.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 238, 270-272. The influx of students from the Byzantine territories at that time is attested by *Anon. Chron.*, an East-Syrian Chronicle from the seventh century, ed. I. Guidi, *Chronica minora I*, CSCO 1,2, Script.Syri 1,2 (Louvain 1903) 18, ll. 1-6/17, ll. 2-7. Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 385, ll. 10/14-15, may also reflect the conditions of his own days, when he makes the



It seems paradoxical that just at this period in its history there began to manifest themselves the first symptoms of the serious problems which were to plunge the School into a deep crisis, from which during the course of the seventh century it would extricate itself only with great difficulty. This crisis is intimately connected with the person of ʿHenana of Adiabene, who was Director of the School between about 571 and 610, and in this capacity occupied the important chair of biblical exegesis.<sup>5</sup>

Much of the background, origins and development of this crisis is no longer perceptible to us, but one thing is clear. In the East Syrian, diophysite church, there were groups who viewed ʿHenana's teaching as a threat to the orthodox doctrine of their church, or even as utter heresy.<sup>6</sup> Neither is there any doubt about the fact that the difficulties with ʿHenana were closely connected to the question of the authority of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the great Antiochene exegete and theologian whose writings had become dominant and normative in the School of Nisibis during the sixth century, both in the praxis of exegetical instruction and in the formation of theology.<sup>7</sup>

bishop of Nisibis Baršauma predict that the founding of the School in Nisibis, being situated at the frontier of the Byzantine empire, will attract students from everywhere.

<sup>5</sup> For ʿHenana's directorate, see Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 234-317. The best general introduction (though in several respects antiquated) to the church-historical background of this period is still J. Labourt's *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide (224-632)* (Paris 1904) 197-287.

<sup>6</sup> See below, n.11.

<sup>7</sup> For an introduction to the topic, see R. Macina, "L'homme à l'école de Dieu. D'Antioche à Nisibe: Profil herméneutique, théologique et kérugmatique du mouvement scolastique nestorien", *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 32 (1982) 87-124, 263-301; 33 (1983) 39-103 (with comprehensive bibliography). The *Anon. Chron.* (as in n.4) 18, ll.6-9/17, ll.7-10, reports that the metropolitan of Nisibis, Gregory, about 596 came into conflict with ʿHenana, because the Director "had all kinds of objections" to Theodore of Mopsuestia "in his (i.e. ʿHenana's) (exegetical) traditions"; cf. also below, notes 29 and 43. It is very probable that ʿHenana criticised *inter alia* Theodore's strong views on the biblical Book of Job and that Canon II of the Synod held under the Catholicos Iso'yahb I in 585 condemned ʿHenana's commentary on Job; cf. O. Braun, *Das Buch der Synhados oder Synodicon Orientale* (Stuttgart/Wien 1900) 198, n.3; J.B. Chabot, *Synodicon orientale ou recueil de synodes nestoriens*, Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques 37 (Paris 1902) 400, n.1; for the condemnation of Theodore's commentary on Job in the Acts of the Fifth Council of Constantinople (553), see R. Devreesse, *Essai sur Théodore de Mopsueste*, Studi e Testi 141 (Città del Vaticano 1948) 34. The condemnation of Theodore and his writings at this Council have undoubtedly much contributed to the polarisation of the standpoints concerning the position of Theodore's works in exegetical teaching in the School of Nisibis during the second half of the sixth

How could this crisis over Henana have arisen? Was he such an original, powerful and self-willed spirit, such an *enfant terrible*, that he broke with the existing tradition moulded by the thought of Theodore of Mopsuestia and introduced novelties into his teaching—and then under the pressure of certain (ecclesiastical-)political developments sharpened his own standpoint to the extent that it brought him into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities, and ended with the dramatic exodus of the majority of the students and teachers from the School?<sup>8</sup> Or was he, as another scholar has recently suggested, a compromiser, who, under the pressure of certain developments in society (namely, the growing penetration of the monophysite church in Iraq), tried to find a theological formula which would be acceptable to monophysites and Chalcedonian orthodoxy, but which turned out to be very threatening to the identity of his own ‘Nestorian’ church?<sup>9</sup>

The diverse and sometimes contradictory opinions concerning Henana stem from the fact that we are virtually excluded from his own ideological world (since only a few writings and fragments of his prolific literary activity are extant).<sup>10</sup> Consequently, we are obliged

---

century. However, the general statement, which can be found often in modern literature, that Henana *rejected* the exegesis of Theodore *in favour of* that of John Chrysostom (cf. e.g. M.G. Morony, *Iraq after the Muslim Conquest* [Princeton 1984] 356) is an oversimplification; this assumption is rooted in Ibn at-Ṭaiyib’s *Fiḥḥ an-naṣrāniya* (eleventh century), W. Hoenerbach-O. Spies (eds.), CSCO 162, Script. Arabici 17 (Louvain 1956) 110, l.32-111, l.3 (German transl.). Henana’s exegesis rather shows a complex character, in which influences of (at least) Theodore, John Chrysostom and the Edessene tradition come to the fore. Moreover, the Syriac bible text seems to play an important role in Henana’s exegesis, as appears from the fragments of his commentaries that have been preserved (see below, n.10).

<sup>8</sup> This is in the main Vööbus’ reconstruction of the events around Henana (above, n.5); cf. also A. Vööbus, *The Statutes of the School of Nisibis*, Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile 12 (Stockholm 1961) 27-29.

<sup>9</sup> See Morony, *Iraq* (as in n.7) 349, 356.

<sup>10</sup> For a survey of Henana’s works see Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 238-242. Two of his *‘ellātā* on the ecclesiastical feasts (see below, notes 23, 24) have survived: ‘The cause of the Friday of Gold’ and ‘The cause of the Rogations’; A. Scher (ed.), PO VII/1, 53-82. Fragments of his exegetical works on the Old and New Testaments have been preserved in Nestorian exegetical compilations from the eighth-tenth centuries; cf. G.J. Reinink, *Studien zur Quellen- und Traditionsgeschichte des Evangelienkommentars der Gannat Bussame*, CSCO 414, Subs. 57 (Louvain 1979) 22, n.36 and 27; in addition, C. Van den Eynde, *Commentaire d’Išo’dad de Merv sur l’Ancien Testament: VI. Psaumes*, CSCO 434, Script.Syri 186 (Louvain 1981) xx-xxii; R. Hespel, R. Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni, Livre des scolies (recension de Séert): II. Memrè VI-XI*, CSCO 432, Script.Syri 188 (Louvain 1982) 42; L. Van Rompay, *Le commentaire sur Genèse-Exode 9,32 du manuscrit (olim) Diyarbakir 22*, CSCO 484, Script.Syri 206 (Louvain 1986) xxvi.

to view him through the strongly coloured spectacles of his opponents,<sup>11</sup> and of the antagonistic reports in sources from later times which accepted the general estimate of him as a wicked heretic of old.<sup>12</sup>

While not wishing to claim to be able to solve all the problems connected with the School of Nisibis in this period, I should like to highlight an aspect of the crisis around Henana which, I believe, has not received sufficient attention. This aspect allows us to see Henana not so much as an instigator of difficulties, but rather as an exponent of a historically complex cultural world which had influenced the intellectual climate in the School of Nisibis from its very beginning.

---

<sup>11</sup> For the fierce polemics against Henana by Babai the Great, who was from 604 until his death in 628 Abbot of the Great Monastery of Izla north-east of Nisibis, cf. A. Guillaumont, *Les 'Kephalaia gnostica' d'Évagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'Origénisme chez les Grecs et chez les Syriens*, *Patristica Sorbonensia* 5 (Paris 1962) 188-196. However, Babai's polemics, imputing all sort of Origenist and monophysite ideas to Henana, have to be considered with the greatest caution. The christology of the two *qnômē* (the Syriac translation of the Greek *hypostasis*), which was developed by East Syrian theologians in reaction to the Neo-Chalcedonian one-hypostasis *synthetos*-christology of the Fifth Council of Constantinople (553) was probably not shared by Henana and his fellow-spirits, but it should be noted that only in 612 (see below, n.48) the two-*qnômē*-christology (represented by Babai a.o.) became the official doctrine of the East Syrian Church and that the christological formulations of the East Syrian Synods of the second half of the sixth century are very close to the Chalcedonian definition; cf. A. Guillaumont, "Justinien et l'église de Perse", *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 23/4 (1969/70) 39-66; L. Abramowski, "Die Christologie Babais des Grossen", in: *Symposium Syriacum 1972*, OrChrA 197 (Roma 1974) 219-244; S. Brock, "The Christology of the Church of the East in the Synods of the Fifth to Early Seventh Centuries: Preliminary Considerations and Materials", in: G. Dragas (ed.), *Aksum-Thyateira: a Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios* (London 1985) 125-142; repr. in S. Brock, *Studies in Syriac Christianity* (London 1992), XII. See also, below notes 12 and 45.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. e.g. Timothy I (Catholicos from 780 until 823), who in a letter to Naṣr writes that the heretic Henana was excommunicated by the Synod held under the Catholicos Sabrišo<sup>c</sup> in 596, a statement which seems to be based rather on the presumption that Henana was the source of the monophysite and theopaschite ideas which were condemned by this Synod; O. Braun (ed.), *Timothei patriarchae I epistulae*, CSCO 74,75, Script.Syri 30,31 (Louvain 1914, 1915) 233, l.21-234, l.9/161, ll.2-16; cf. Braun, *Das Buch des Synhados* (as in n.7) 282-286; Chabot, *Synodicon orientale* (as in n.7) 196-200, 456-461. Timothy's quotation from Henana's commentary on Luke in this context, which should demonstrate Henana's heretical christological views, shows in fact the influence of the exegesis of John Chrysostom (*In Matth. hom. 12*, PG 57, 201-202). Anyhow, the suggestion that Henana fostered monophysite feelings, accepting *one nature* in Christ (Morony, *Iraq* [as in n.7] 356), is not confirmed by the fragments of Henana's exegesis of Hebrews in the commentary of Išo<sup>c</sup>dad of Merw; cf. e.g. M.D. Gibson (ed.), *The Commentaries of Išo<sup>c</sup>dad of Merw, Bishop of Hadatha (c.850 A.D.)*, in *Syriac and English* V 1/2, *Horae Semiticae* XI (Cambridge 1916) 160, ll.2-7/108.

Nisibis was the successor of Edessa not only in the sense of a theological *alma mater* with a claim to orthodoxy; it also saw itself as the guardian of the intellectual heritage of the School of Edessa, and therefore vigorously pursued the process of the assimilation of Greek theological and philosophical literature and culture, a process which had begun in Edessa.

We have at our disposal a document of the first rank, which gives us a direct *entrée* into the intellectual climate and circumstances in the School of Nisibis, around the period from 582 to 595.<sup>13</sup> (This document is the source from which the opening words of this paper are cited.) In the title it is ascribed to Barḥadbešabba ʿArbaya, bishop of Ḥalwan,<sup>14</sup> but it must be accepted that a confusion has arisen between two persons named Barḥadbešabba, both of whom were connected with the School of Nisibis in the sixth century.<sup>15</sup> However, it is certain that the Barḥadbešabba who composed this document belonged to the ‘brothers’ of the School (perhaps as a member of its teaching staff) during Henana’s directorate, and that he was a loyal supporter of the Director.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> The work was composed after the elevation of Išoʿyahb of Arzun as Catholicos in 582; cf. Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 390, ll.2/3). Addai Scher, Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 323) took 604 for the *terminus ante quem*, assuming that the author belonged to the teachers and students who left the School during the Catholicosate of Sabrišoʿ (d.604); see below, n.16. Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 295, suggested that the work was composed not beyond the time when Gregory took over the seat of the metropolitan of Nisibis about 596. It is indeed highly probable that the work was composed during the Catholicosate of Išoʿyahb I (582-595) and it perhaps shows acquaintance with the synodical decisions of 585; see below, n.42.

<sup>14</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 327.

<sup>15</sup> The author certainly has to be distinguished from Barḥadbešabba ʿArbaya, who composed after 569 the ‘Histories of the holy fathers who were persecuted for the sake of the truth’, ed. by F. Nau, *La première partie de l’histoire de Barḥadbešabba ʿArbaia*, PO XXXIII/2; *La seconde partie de l’histoire de Barḥadbešabba ʿArbaia*, PO IX/5; cf. Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 280-282. Vööbus, 294-296 distinguished Barḥadbešabba ʿArbaya from Barḥadbešabba, who is known as bishop of Ḥalwan, but I agree with J.-M. Fiey, *Jalons pour une histoire de l’église en Iraq*, CSCO 310, Subs. 36 (Louvain 1970) 25-26 (cf. also Gero, *Baršauma* [as in n.2] 5), that it has to be assumed that Barḥadbešabba ʿArbaya, who wrote the ‘Histories’ as the chief of the *bādōgē* of the School of Nisibis, became bishop of Ḥalwan after his departure from the School; see below, n.16. Barḥadbešabba, the author of ‘The cause of the foundation of the schools’, was later on probably identified with Barḥadbešabba ʿArbaya, bishop of Ḥalwan, since the latter was a very renowned author; cf. *Anon. Chron.* (as in n.4) 22, ll.25-26/20, ll.23-24.

<sup>16</sup> The supposition that Barḥadbešabba later on deserted Henana is based on the dubious identification of this author with Ḥadbešabba ʿArbaya, bishop of Ḥalwan, who according to the *Chronicle of Seert* (A. Scher [ed.], *Histoire nestorienne*

The work has the Syriac title *‘ellā da-syām mawtbā d-ʿeskūlē*, which can best be translated ‘The cause of the foundation of the schools’.<sup>17</sup> It is a unique document, for it is the only ‘Speech for the commencement of the academic year’ which is preserved in Syriac literature.<sup>18</sup> In the prologue Barḥadbešabba addresses the students, who have left their homelands and parents and given up earthly joys to taste heavenly food through their studies in the School.<sup>19</sup> He urges them to be diligent in their work and to obey the statutes of the School,<sup>20</sup> and at the conclusion of the prologue he asks for God’s help, so that the students, when they return to their own countries, may spread the true ‘fear of God’ among men who ‘are in error’.<sup>21</sup> In the epilogue Barḥadbešabba briefly explains the grounds for the semester system, exhorts the students to respect one another and their teachers, and ends by urging them again to devote themselves fully to their studies.<sup>22</sup>

As the title shows, Barḥadbešabba’s speech has been composed according to the pattern of the *‘ellātā*, a genre cultivated in the School of Nisibis in the sixth century.<sup>23</sup> These *‘ellātā* were strictly isagogic writings, which among other things dealt with the *why*, *from what* and *to what end* of ecclesiastical feasts and institutions.<sup>24</sup> The core of the

---

[*chronique de Séert*], II, PO XIII/4, 511-512) belonged to the teachers who left the School not long after 596; cf. Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 308-310.

<sup>17</sup> Macina, *L’homme* 32 (as in n.7) 118, n.27 suggests the translation “Exposé introductif de la Session de l’École (ou des Écoles, selon les manuscrits)”, assuming that the words *syām mawtbā* bear upon “«poser une session», c’est-à-dire «siéger», «ouvrir la session», et donc ici, commencer l’année scolaire”. However, this interpretation of the expression *syām mawtbā* is problematic.

<sup>18</sup> It is possible that Eliša<sup>c</sup> bar Quzbye (Director of the School from 503 to about 510) and Abraham of Bet Rabban (Director from about 510 to about 569) also wrote *‘ellātā* on the same topic (now lost); cf. Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 128, 142-143. For possible examples from the seventh century, see A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur* (Bonn 1922) 208.

<sup>19</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 330, ll.8-13/9-15.

<sup>20</sup> Idem, 322, ll.12-15/14-17. Edition with English translation of the statutes by Vööbus, *The Statutes* (as in n.8) 51-105.

<sup>21</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 333, ll.3-7/3-11.

<sup>22</sup> Idem 393, l.3-397, l.2/393, l.5-397, l.2.

<sup>23</sup> It was Eliša<sup>c</sup> bar Quzbye, the second Director of the School, who, according to Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 294, may have introduced the genre in the School of Nisibis. W.F. Macomber, “The Theological Synthesis of Cyrus of Edessa, an East Syrian Theologian of the Mid Sixth Century”, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 30 (1964) 6, suggested that Narsai, the first Director of the School, had already initiated the genre of *‘ellātā*, “that is discourses, that gave theological explanations of various aspects of the mystery celebrated by the liturgical feast”; however, there is no decisive evidence for this assumption.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. A. Baumstark, “Die nestorianischen Schriften ‘de causis festorum’”,

work, in fact, presents an appraisal which, after a theological-philosophical and epistemological introduction to the doctrine of God,<sup>25</sup> offers an historical survey of the *paideia* of God and of the Old Testament, pagan and Christian 'schools', beginning with the creation and extending to the foundation of the School of Nisibis together with its history down to the time of the author.<sup>26</sup>

The climax of this dissertation is an encomium upon the Director, Ḥenana, which ends as follows:

He [Ḥenana] is friendly, gracious and patient, and does not seek honour for himself, like others. And behold, his writings are spread all around. Even in the places from which he is far removed, he is present through his writings and he teaches. Through the mouth of all his pupils his fame and praise are spread abroad in all schools, far and near. Therefore we beg and beseech of God, that the universal Providence, when it is pleased to take him from us unto itself, will choose for us from his [Ḥenana's] sons and pupils a [successor] like him, who has been educated in the manner and way of his teaching, who holds fast to what he has transmitted, and who always holds him in pious memory, as a son his father.<sup>27</sup>

Barḥadbešabba's panegyric of Ḥenana is no conventional and obligatory praise of the Director before the assembled 'brothers' of the School; on the contrary, it is shot through with apologetic tendencies. Barḥadbešabba presents Ḥenana as a champion of orthodoxy who, despite Satan's assaults on him, with help from divine Providence persevered in his work as an interpreter, and like 'the blessed Interpreter' (i.e., Theodore of Mopsuestia) also transmitted his exegetical teaching to his pupils in written form, through the composition of commentaries on the entire Old and New Testaments.<sup>28</sup> His exegetical writings are solidly based on tradition; but this tradition is presented as pluriform, and in Ḥenana's use of the works of his

---

*OrChr* 1 (1901) 320-342; Macomber, *The Theological Synthesis* (as in n.23) 6-8. For a survey of the *ʿellātā* composed in the sixth century and the editions of the texts that have survived, see Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 128, 142, 157, 173-174, 241, 279, 281; Macomber, *op.cit.*, 6, n.3, 7, n.2; Macina, *L'homme* 32 (as in n.7) 118, n.27. The scholastic function of the genre is evident and many of its representatives were originally delivered orally by the teachers of the School; cf. W.F. Macomber (ed.), *Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa, an East Syrian Theologian of the Mid Sixth Century*, CSCO 356, Script.Syri 156 (Louvain 1974) VI.

<sup>25</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 333, l.8-345, l.6/333, l.12-345, l.8.

<sup>26</sup> Idem 345, l.7-393, l.3/345, l.9-393, l.3.

<sup>27</sup> Idem 392, l.10-393, l.3/392, l.13-393, l.3.

<sup>28</sup> Idem 390, l.10-391, l.9/390, l.12-393, l.11. See also below, n.47.

predecessors we are to see the hand of a master who selects the right nourishment for the hungry souls of his pupils. In this connection Barḥadbešabba compares Ḥenana's exegetical writings, in a fine *similitudo*, to the richly furnished table of a king, on which there is laid out not one but many dishes.<sup>29</sup>

When Barḥadbešabba compares Ḥenana with Theodore, he is giving the Director the right to compose commentaries on the entire Bible, and in these commentaries to work over the tradition, just as Theodore of Mopsuestia himself in his commentaries had taken up older, scattered traditions and interpretations, and out of them, like a sculptor, made "a perfect and admirable image of the divine essence".<sup>30</sup>

Barḥadbešabba's apology therefore seems to presuppose that Ḥenana's critics asserted the *exclusive* authority of Theodore, and accused the Director of permitting other influences upon his exegetical instruction—which opened the door to all sorts of heretical ideas. Barḥadbešabba, however, considers the complaints raised against his Director to be unjustified, and he intends that his reasons should be deduced from his historical account of the *paideia* of God.

For Barḥadbešabba the great authority and pre-eminent position of Theodore in the history of the Christian *paideia* remain unchallenged. Not only in a purely formal way does he confirm the special position of the Antiochene theologian. In the employment of Aristotelian logic,<sup>31</sup> in the conception of the divine *paideia* which

---

<sup>29</sup> Idem 392, ll.2-9/3-12. Tradition is here in Barḥadbešabba's imagery represented by the word 'treasures', i.e. those writings and traditions, which have to be regarded as belonging to the rich tradition of his church. Just as 'every scholar of the Kingdom of Heaven' draws from his treasures new and old things, so Ḥenana is transmitting in his writings at one time old things, at another time new things, then again the writings of the ancients. Thus Barḥadbešabba presents Ḥenana not as a renovator in the sense of somebody introducing elements, who are foreign to his community, but as a creative and learned mind, who in his exegetical teaching and writings also draws new elements from the 'treasures' of his church. Barḥadbešabba is no doubt alluding to the fact that Ḥenana in some respects disagreed with the exegetical opinions of Theodore of Mopsuestia (see above, n.7). It is interesting to note, that Barḥadbešabba 'Arbaya, *La seconde partie de l'histoire* (as in n.15) 622, ll.8-9/11-13, uses the same imagery of a 'table with many good things', referring to Mar Abraham's explaining the exegetical works of Theodore of Mopsuestia in accordance with the tradition (*mašlmānūtā*), which he received from his teacher.

<sup>30</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 378, l.4-379, l.11/378, l.4-379, l.12.

<sup>31</sup> See esp. Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 333, l.8-345, l.6/333, l.12-345, l.8. Cf. D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch: A Study of Early Christian Thought in the East* (Cambridge 1982) 108. Barḥadbešabba's explanations seem to presuppose a Syriac translation of the *Organon*, or at least of the *Eisagoge* of Porphyry (see also below, n.35).

prepares men in this mortal *katastasis* for the future *katastasis* of immortality,<sup>32</sup> in theological anthropology<sup>33</sup> and in biblical exegesis and hermeneutics<sup>34</sup>—in all matters Barḥadbešabba conforms to our picture of the teaching of the School in the sixth century, where Aristotle was employed in the systematic formulation of theological knowledge<sup>35</sup> and where the exegetical-theological legacy of Theodore played a dominant role.<sup>36</sup>

At the same time, however, Barḥadbešabba makes clear that the tradition of the School is not ‘monolithic’, and that, while Theodore is indeed the greatest authority, he is not the only one. Other pupils of the School of Diodore, such as Basil, John Chrysostom and Evagrius, also belong to the orthodox Antiochene tradition.<sup>37</sup> And

---

<sup>32</sup> Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch* (as in n.31) 63, rightly observed that Barḥadbešabba derived the theme from Theodore of Mopsuestia; cf. e.g. R.A. Norris, *Manhood and Christ: A Study in the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Oxford 1963) 166-168; U. Wickert, *Studien zu den Pauluskommentaren Theodors von Mopsuestia als Beitrag zum Verständnis der antiochenischen Theologie*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 27 (Berlin 1962) 89-101; R.A. Greer, *The Captain of our Salvation: A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 15 (Tübingen 1973) 203-206; Macina, *L’homme* 33 (as in n.7) 39-52.

<sup>33</sup> In his description of the ‘School of Paradise’ Barḥadbešabba presupposes the typical Theodorian view of Adam’s being created mortal; Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 353, ll.1-13/352, l.18 353, l.17; cf. Norris, *Manhood and Christ* (as in n.32) 173-184. Note that Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 263, assumes that Henana abandoned this view held by Theodore.

<sup>34</sup> In his description of the ‘School of Alexandria’ Barḥadbešabba condemns, in a way very related to Theodore of Mopsuestia’s polemics against Philo and Origen, the allegorical exegesis that was introduced at the cost of the historicity of the Scriptures; cf. Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 375, l.5-376, l.4, and L. Van Rompay (ed.), *Théodore de Mopsueste. Fragments syriaques du Commentaire des Psaumes (Psaume 118 et Psaumes 138-148)*, CSCO 435 and 436, Script.Syri 189 and 190 (Louvain 1982) 11, l.15-13, l.24/14, l.27-18, l.2. Note that Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 243, assumes that Henana was charmed by the idea, borrowed by Origen from Philo, that every detail in the Scriptures has a spiritual meaning and by the application of interpretation through the artificial theory of allegory.

<sup>35</sup> S. Brock has suggested that Aristotelian logic was introduced into the curriculum of the School of Nisibis in the first half of the sixth century by Mar Aba (d.552); see S. Brock, ‘From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning’, in: N.G. Garsoïan, T.F. Mathews, R.W. Thompson (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period* (Washington 1982) 21-22, 26; repr. in S. Brock, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (London 1984) V; cf. also John W. Watt, ‘Grammar, Rhetoric, and the Enkyklios Paideia in Syriac’, *ZDMG* 143 (1993) 64.

<sup>36</sup> See above, n.7.

<sup>37</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 377, l.6-378, l.3. With Basil and Evagrius probably Basil of Caesarea and Evagrius Ponticus are meant, but only John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia were actually the pupils of Diodore of



the works of Ephraem Syrus and the ancient apostolic, orally transmitted tradition of the School of Edessa belong to the orthodox tradition which passed to the School of Nisibis.<sup>38</sup>

Reading Barḥadbešabba's apology for Ḥenana in the light of the whole speech, we gain the impression that two currents existed in the School at that time: a more open or 'liberal' tendency, which approved of the introduction of other influences beside Theodore in exegetical instruction, provided they belonged to the tradition and were recognised as orthodox authorities; and on the other hand, a 'strict-Theodorian' tendency, for which the normative quality of Theodore's works carried the implication that they should be the exclusive manual for the exegesis of the biblical writings.

Modern scholarship has been puzzled by Barḥadbešabba's positive attitude to Ḥenana. Addai Scher, the editor of 'The cause of the foundation of the schools', regarded Barḥadbešabba as an opportunist. Initially he is supposed to have defended his Director and kept quiet about the fact that Ḥenana repudiated the doctrines of Theodore, in order to re-establish harmony in the School. Later, however, he is said to have opted for the stronger party and

---

Tarsus (d. before 394). Evagrius' Origenism was condemned by the Fifth Council of Constantinople in 553 (Guillaumont, *Les 'Kephalaia gnostica'* [as in n.11] 133-159), but his *Kephalaia Gnostica* were widely read in the East Syrian Church in a Syriac translation, in which the Origenist-Evagrian christology was eliminated. Babai the Great (above, n.11) wrote a commentary on this version, in which he tried to eliminate the remaining Origenist tendencies; cf. Guillaumont, *op. cit.*, 259-290; G. Chediath, *The Christology of Mar Babai the Great*, Oriental Institute of Religious Studies 49 (Kottayam 1982) 32.

<sup>38</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 382, l.3-383, l.6/382, l.4-383, l.7, defines this tradition as follows: 1. The (*written*) 'traditions' of Ephraem Syrus, based on the ancient tradition of the congregation of Edessa, founded by the Apostle Addai. 2. The 'tradition of the School', representing the *orally* transmitted ancient tradition of the School of Edessa (in my opinion, Barḥadbešabba makes no fundamental distinction between this tradition and the ancient tradition, mentioned under 1); Narsai, the last Director of the School of Edessa and the first Director of the School of Nisibis included it in his homilies and in his other works. 3. The commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia, translated into Syriac under the Director Qiyore, the predecessor of Narsai. For a discussion of the 'tradition of the School' see L. Van Rompay, "Quelques remarques sur la tradition syriaque de l'oeuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste", in: H.J.W. Drijvers, R. Lavenant, C. Molenberg, and G.J. Reinink (eds.), *IV Symposium Syriacum 1984: Literary Genres in Syriac Literature*, OrChrA 229 (Roma 1987) 38-41. We should, however, not lose sight of the argumentative context of the whole speech, in which Barḥadbešabba wants to demonstrate, that confining the exegetical instruction in the School of Nisibis to the commentaries of Theodore is *not in conformity* with tradition. For Barḥadbešabba's use of the terms 'tradition' (*mašlmānūtā*) and 'explanation' (*puššāqā*) see below, n.42.

abandoned his Director.<sup>39</sup> Anton Baumstark and Arthur Vööbus were of the opinion that Barḥadbešabba wrote this work before the conflict broke out around Ḥenana.<sup>40</sup> D.S. Wallace-Hadrill supposes that when Barḥadbešabba wrote the work, he had already betrayed his Director, and ‘‘suffered from the bad conscience of the renegade whose deserted master still lives to reproach him for his apostasy’’.<sup>41</sup> None of these explanations is satisfactory. I believe that Barḥadbešabba’s attitude to Ḥenana must be interpreted in the framework of the whole speech. At that time in the School there was a heated debate over the question of what belonged to the *mašlmā-nūtā*, the tradition, accepted by the School, and to what extent this tradition should be transmitted to the students in exegetical instruction. Barḥadbešabba identifies this tradition in the course of his historical account of the *paideia* of God, whose faithful heir was now the School of Nisibis. In so doing, he legitimises the fact that Ḥenana sets before the students other ‘dishes’ belonging to the tradition, beside Theodore, the Interpreter *par excellence* of the East Syrian tradition.<sup>42</sup>

I cannot here go into the question of whether Ḥenana, by allowing non-Theodorian influence in his exegetical instruction (in the areas of christology, theological anthropology and the methodology of exegesis), eventually overstepped the boundaries acceptable even to the ‘liberal’ tendency in the School.<sup>43</sup> But in all this, one thing

---

<sup>39</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 323. However, Scher (ed.) ascribes the work in conformity with the title to Barḥadbešabba ‘Arbaya, bishop of Ḥalwan (see above, notes 14, 15, 16).

<sup>40</sup> Baumstark, *Geschichte* (as in n.18) 136, 349 (note to p.136); Vööbus, *History* (as in n.1) 295.

<sup>41</sup> Wallace-Hadrill, *Christian Antioch* (as in n.31) 65. Wallace-Hadrill also takes Barḥadbešabba ‘Arbaya, bishop of Ḥalwan, to be the author.

<sup>42</sup> According to Barḥadbešabba ‘tradition’ (*mašlmānūtā*) and ‘explanation’ (*puššāqā*) of the Scriptures can be either oral or written. In oral form ‘traditions’ (*mašlmānwātā*) can be transmitted by the teachers in the practice of the exegetical instruction (*puššāqā*). In written form they can be transmitted in written commentaries (*puššāqē*); cf. Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 374, ll.10/12; 375, ll.10/12-13; 378, ll.1/1-2, 10-11/10-11, 15/15; 379, l.1/378, l.16; 382, ll.8/9, 9/11, 12/15; 383, ll.2/3, 5/6-7, 14/15; 387, l.7/9; 388, l.9/10; 389, l.4/5; 391, ll.4/5, 7/8-9; 393, l.3/2. It is not impossible that Barḥadbešabba in his interpretation of what belongs to the *mašlmānwātā* of the School is also responding to the decisions of the Synod of Išo‘yahb I (585), by which those people are condemned, who are ‘orthodox in name only’, who are disturbing the *mašlmānwātā* of the church in resisting the true instruction, embodied in the *mašlmānwātā* of Theodore; Chabot, *Synodicon orientale* (as in n.7) 137, ll.22-26/399 (see also above, n.7).

<sup>43</sup> However, it appears very likely to me that the so-called exodus of Ḥenana’s

should not be forgotten. The great reputation of the School of Nisibis at the time of Ḥenana's directorate attracted many "quarrelsome people" (as an anonymous but reliable East Syrian chronicler of the seventh century put it), even from territories belonging to the Byzantine Empire,<sup>44</sup> and the christological disputes which had once taken place in Edessa and led to the end of its 'School of the Persians' now threatened to re-appear in Nisibis, the bulwark of East Syrian orthodoxy. Among these "quarrelsome people" there were no doubt Christians of monophysite sympathies, who rejected the works of Theodore but could unleash all kinds of christological discussions on the basis of other authorities accepted in the School of Nisibis.<sup>45</sup> The 'strict-Theodorian' tendency in Nisibis could therefore point to the immediate dangers for the students created by the lessening of the emphasis on Theodore in exegetical instruction. Theodore, who had once, figuratively speaking, been driven out of Edessa by the monophysites,<sup>46</sup> was to be the students' only weapon against the heresy now invading Mesopotamia; as a consequence, Theodore had to be the determining factor in the formation of their theological identity and that of their church.<sup>47</sup>

---

opponents from the School, which took place during the Catholicosate of Sabrišo<sup>c</sup> (596-604) (cf. Labourt, *Le christianisme* [as in n.5] 215-217; Vööbus, *History* [as in n.1] 309-310), was the ultimate result of the operations of Gregory, the metropolitan of Nisibis, who opposed Henana (see above, n.7). Gregory, in his efforts to dismiss Henana from his chair, will undoubtedly have mobilised the anti-Henana forces in the School. When Gregory for several reasons came into conflict with the people of Nisibis and lost the support of the Catholicos Sabrišo<sup>c</sup> and had to leave the city by order of the king Khosroes II (*Anon. Chron.* [as in n.4] 18, ll.8-26/17, ll.10-28), the climate in the School had become politicised to such a degree, that the anti-Henana faction could hardly maintain its position in the School.

<sup>44</sup> *Anon. Chron.* (as in n.4) 18, ll.4-6/17, ll.5-7.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. the Synods of 585 (Išo'yahb I), 596 (Sabrišo<sup>c</sup>) and 605 (Gregory I), which combine an apology for Theodore with an attack on *inter alia* monophysite views and the defence of diophysitism; Chabot, *Synodicon orientale* (as in n.7) 136, l.3-138, l.15, 397-400; 196, l.26-197, l.3/457; 209, l.22-211, l.29/473-476. See also below, n.47.

<sup>46</sup> Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 380, l.7-381, l.4/380, l.6-381, l.5.

<sup>47</sup> For the increasing influence, mission and organisation of monophysitism in Iraq in the second half of the sixth century, see Labourt, *Le christianisme* (as in n.5) 217-231; Fiey, *Jalons* (as in n.15) 127-137; Morony, *Iraq* (as in n.7) 372-380. We may perhaps conjecture that behind the "quarrelsome people" invading the School of Nisibis under the directorate of Ḥenana was a preconceived action of the monophysites, trying to attack the main centre of learning and diffusion of diophysitism in the Persian empire from the inside, and that Barḥadbešabba, *Cause* (as in n.2) 390, ll.11/13, in speaking on the "flock of Satan", which attacked Ḥenana, is referring to these people. In that case, the following troubles, to which Barḥadbešabba is alluding (390, l.11-391, l.2/390, l.13-391, l.2), may be due to the fact that the

In the opening paragraphs of this paper, I pointed to the apparent paradox whereby the School of Nisibis descended into a deep crisis just at the very moment when it had reached the pinnacle of its fame. Perhaps, however, there is no paradox, and the explanation is, in part, that the School fell victim to its own success. At any rate, I should like to conclude with the proposition that the controversial figure of Ḥenana of Adiabene should be considered also from the perspective discussed here—that is, as an exponent of a complex and diverse intellectual world, whose inner tensions and contradictions, already present in the tradition, became polarised at the end of the sixth century under the pressure of certain historical developments, and led to an open conflict over the question of which tradition should define the religious identity of the East Syrian church and therefore the exegetical teaching of the School. With the benefit of hindsight we can say that neither of the two currents achieved an absolute victory. The ‘strict-Theodorian’ tendency enjoyed a christological-theological triumph at the episcopal gathering of 612,<sup>48</sup> but the East Syrian exegetes of the seventh century show that the pluriform Antiochene and Edessene tradition championed by Barḥadbešabba lived on in their teaching and exegetical writings.<sup>49</sup>

---

‘strict-Theodorian’ faction reproached the Director for not being able to take the right defence against the heretical views in allowing other influences beside that of Theodore in his exegetical teaching.

<sup>48</sup> The profession of faith of 612, offered by the bishops of the East Syrian Church to Khosroes II, takes a “hard-line” position, “expressed in fairly uncompromising Antiochene phraseology” (Brock, *The Christology of the Church of the East* [as in n. 11] 127), adopting the christology of the two *qnômē*, which became the official doctrine of the Nestorians (see above, n. 11); Chabot, *Synodicon orientale* (as in n. 7) 562-598; L. Abramowski, A.E. Goodman, *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts*, vol. I: Syriac Text, vol. II: Introduction, Translation and Indexes, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 19 (Cambridge 1972) 150-169, 88-101. This profession of faith was drafted on account of a disputation between representatives of the East Syrian Church and the monophysites at the instigation of the monophysite Gabriel of Sinjar, the doctor of Khosrau.

<sup>49</sup> See Reinink, *Studien* (as in n. 10) 162-164, 282-284, 287-291; idem, “Fragmente der Evangelienexegese des Katholikos Ḥenanišoʿ I”, in: R. Lavenant (ed.), *V Symposium Syriacum 1988*, OrChrA 236 (Roma 1990) 90-91. For the way in which the Nestorian monk Dadišoʿ Qaṭraya (second half of the seventh century) defines the position of the different exegetical lines (Theodore, Basil, John Chrysostom, Evagrius, the ‘spiritual exegesis’) in the tradition of his church, see P. Bettolo, “Esegesi e purezza di cuore. La testimonianza di Dadišoʿ Qaṭraya (VII sec.), nestoriana e solitario”, *Annali di Storia dell’ Esegesi* 3 (1986) 201-213.



## THE KORAN AND ITS EXEGESIS: FROM MEMORISING TO LEARNING

FRED LEEMHUIS

Its beginnings were quite humble, but within two centuries after the revelation of the Koran, the Arab-Islamic world was bustling with intellectual activity from the Atlantic to the Indus, from the Caucasus to the Gulf of Aden. From the beginning, devotion and learning focused both on the Koran and the venerated receiver and transmitter of God's latest message, who was of course, during his lifetime, its first and foremost interpreter.

As long as the Prophet lived and during the time of his first successors, Medina was Islam's geographical centre of religious learning, while Mecca was the cultic centre of Islam. While Mecca was to retain that position, Medina was soon superseded by other centres of learning. The sending of copies of the vulgate text of the Koran to the other four *amṣār*, or metropolises of the new empire, by the caliph ʿUthmān, if not historically reliable then at least symbolically true, marks the fact that religious learning in the great Arab-Islamic civilisation, or better civilisations, became text-centred: whatever geographical centres of learning may have existed, the Koran became the ideological centre of Islam's religious learning, which often dominated many other kinds of learning as well.

One only has to look at the eleven volumes of Fuat Sezgin's monumental *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums* to realise how text-centred the Arab-Islamic civilisation did become: a civilisation with an enormous book production. In Spain alone, in the last half of the tenth century, we find seventy public libraries, among them very large ones like the library of the caliph al-Ḥakam II in Córdoba which held some 600.000 volumes.<sup>1</sup> A fact which compares quite favourably with the number of volumes with which

---

<sup>1</sup> Tarif Al Samman, "Geschichte und Kultur der Arabischen Welt", in: Tarif Al Samman, Otto Mazal, *Die Arabische Welt und Europa, Ausstellung der Handschriften- und Inkunabelsammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Handbuch und Katalog* (Graz 1988) 26-27.

the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris started some 400 years later: 1200.<sup>2</sup>

When we look at this enormous book production an obvious fact stands out: producing books meant copying by hand, because a purely mechanical way of producing books did not exist. A copyist had to be able to read and write well, and in many respects a copyist was to an author what a performing musician is to a composer. No wonder many copyists became authors in their own right, albeit quite often in the perhaps somewhat secondary sense of marginal commentators.

The astonishingly large-scale production of books was, in the security of the Pax Islamica, largely made possible by the combination of the relatively easily acquired ability to read and write with the availability of relatively cheap material on which to write: paper. The use of paper spread over the Arab-Islamic world from the beginning of the ninth century onward, when the first paper mill of Samarkand was succeeded by many others.<sup>3</sup> It can be argued that the important part printing played in the democratisation of the book was foreshadowed by that of paper in the Arab-Islamic civilisation.<sup>4</sup> Large numbers of people devoted at least part of their time to dealing with written texts, copying them, commenting on them, choosing from them, reordering them, trying to understand them, teaching them, applying them, etc. The diffusion of learning in the fourth century of Islam, the tenth century AD, which may be regarded as the golden age of the Arabic Islamic civilisation, the era in which the great exegete of the Koran, al-Ṭabarī, lived, was aptly characterised by Claude Cahen:

Quelle que soit le rôle matériel et culturel des cours princières, il est certain que, face à la culture européenne de la même époque, la culture musulmane se caractérise socialement par une plus large diffusion, liée à l'essor urbain et à la fabrication du papier. La plupart des «savants» étaient des hommes de métier. Pas de ville, sans parler des princes, qui n'eut pas sa ou ses bibliothèques, ses écoles et ses

---

<sup>2</sup> "Bibliothèque Nationale", in: *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Chicago etc. 1974-1991, 15th ed.) vol.2, 196; cf. n.1 above where the number of 900 vols. is mentioned.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. "Kāghad", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden 1960— ) vol.4, 419-420, and A. Hourani, *A History of the Arab Peoples* (Cambridge Mass. 1991) 49-50.

<sup>4</sup> Cl. Cahen, *l'Islam des origines au début de l'empire ottoman* (Paris 1970) 119-120.

étudiants, autour de mosquées ou de fondations privées, car c'était faire oeuvre pie que de contribuer à répandre la science. On faisait rechercher à travers le monde les manuscrits qui la contenaient, et des armées de copistes travaillaient à les multiplier. . . . Les étudiants, souvent âgés, allaient de maître en maître et de ville en ville compléter leur «quête de science»: ils «lisaient sous» un tel, plus exactement écoutaient, en prenant des notes, un maître lire un texte de base et le commenter, puis ils discutaient. Ceux qui avaient donné leurs preuves étaient autorisés à transmettre sous son autorité ce que le maître avait lui-même déjà transmis. Le but était de devenir omniscient.<sup>5</sup>

In Islam's golden age this transmission of learning and especially religious learning often took the form of dictated lectures, sometimes attended by tens of thousands, where the lecturer was assisted by hundreds of secondary dictators—at least, if we believe the reports quoted by the sixth/twelfth century author al-Samʿānī in his book about the methodology of dictation.<sup>6</sup>

The dominant attitude towards knowledge and learning in the Classical Arab-Islamic society was shaped to a large extent by the way that society had learned to deal with its holy text. How the quest for the true meaning of the Koran was conceptualised determined to a large extent how the quest for knowledge in general took shape. Indeed, it may be argued, with Naṣr Abū Zaid, that learning in the Arab-Islamic world was largely generated by the need for interpretation of the Koran:

The Koran has had and still has in our civilisation an undeniably cultural role in shaping the features of this civilisation and in determining the nature of its learning. If, with much simplification, we may rightly summarise a civilisation in one of its dimensions, we may rightly say that the old Egyptian civilisation was the civilisation of 'the after-death' and that the Greek civilisation was the civilisation of 'the mind'. The Arabic civilisation then is the civilisation of 'the text'. Thus, if a civilisation centres around 'a text' which, as such, constitutes one of its fundamental pivots, then certainly 'interpretation'—the other side of the text—constitutes one of the important mechanisms of its culture and civilisation to generate learning. This 'interpretation' may be direct, i.e., the result of directly dealing with the text and of intentionally addressing it to extract its sense and meaning; this is interpretation in the domain of religious learning. Interpretation may

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem 193.

<sup>6</sup> *Die Methodik des Diktatkollegs (Adab al-implāʾ wa'l-istimplāʾ) von ʿAbd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad al-Samʿānī*, hrsg. von M. Weisweiler (Leiden 1952) 15-18 of the Arabic text.



also be an indirect one; this we find in the domains of other learning. When a text is the pivot of a civilisation or a culture, then its explanations and interpretations inevitably proliferate.<sup>7</sup>

So, how did it all start? How was the nature of the learning which dealt with the text of the Koran determined? The beginnings were quite straightforward, as we learn from the indigenous sources that deal with the early history of Islam: in order to be recited correctly and beautifully, the Koran was learned by heart by its most fervent adherents.<sup>8</sup> They apparently were rather keen on reciting the text correctly; we have quite a few reports of people, who upon hearing someone else reciting parts of the Koran differently, confronted the prophet with the alternative readings.<sup>9</sup> That these reports are mentioned in the context of the assertion of the miracle that the Koran was revealed and thus correctly could be recited *‘alā sab‘a ah̄ruf* or, as it later came to be interpreted, in seven manners of reading, does not alter the fact that they express a real concern with a correct recitation of the Holy Text.<sup>10</sup>

After Mohammed’s death, we gradually find the activity of learning to recite the Koran correctly becoming more and more organised: a phenomenon that is probably not unrelated to the gradual enforcement of a vulgate text of the Koran.<sup>11</sup> In the early stage, the disciplines of recitation and interpretation seem not yet to have been separated, as is documented by traditions like the one from Ibn ‘Abbās, the ‘father’ of Koranic exegesis, according to which he recited the second *sūra* and explained it verse by verse,<sup>12</sup> or the more specific one from ‘Abdallāh ibn Mas‘ūd: “When one of us learned ten verses, he did not go further until he knew their meaning and

<sup>7</sup> Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zaid, *Maḥmūd al-naṣṣ. Dirāsa fī ‘ulūm al-qur’ān* (Cairo 1990) 11.

<sup>8</sup> See e.g. *Ibn Saad. Biographien Muhameds, seiner Gefährten und der späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230 der Flucht*, hrsg. von E. Sachau, Band 6, hrsg. von K. V. Zetterstéen (Leiden 1909) 60, ll.13-23.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. *Sunan al-Nisā’i, Kitāb al-iftitāḥ* 37, *Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal* 5, 124, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Kitāb faḍā’il al-qur’ān*, 37ff.; cf. also next note.

<sup>10</sup> The lemma *qr’* IV in the *Concordance et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane* par A.J. Wensinck etc. (Leiden 1936-1988) vol.5, 338-339 offers a sufficiency of examples.

<sup>11</sup> See A. Neuwirth, “Koran”, in: H. Gätje (ed.), *Grundriss der Arabischen Philologie*, Bd. II: *Literaturwissenschaft* (Wiesbaden 1987) 101-113.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibn Saad. Biographien Muhameds, seiner Gefährten und der späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230 der Flucht*, hrsg. von E. Sachau, Band 2,2 hrsg. von F. Schwallby (Leiden 1912) 121, ll.9-12.

how to act in accordance with them.”<sup>13</sup> It is not surprising then that in a tradition Saʿīd ibn Djubair is quoted as saying: “Who recites the Koran and then does not explain it, is like a blind man or a bedouin.”<sup>14</sup>

Actually, these beginnings of Koranic exegesis were rather modest; we may take for granted that the generation that first got to know the revelation understood its meaning and needed only marginal guidance for its interpretation. That as time went by the text of the Koran required more and more interpretation was largely due to the fact that it was the holy text itself which had been instrumental in the establishment of a society and a linguistic community which was quite different from the society in which the Koran was revealed.

If we look carefully at the source material, it becomes clear that probably the earliest exegetical activity occurred incidentally in the course of teaching to recite the text properly, and involved giving synonyms for words of which the meaning was no longer entirely clear. Some of these oral glosses sometimes even found their way into the recitation itself, which, notwithstanding the promulgation of the vulgate text, was not entirely fixed everywhere.

This state of affairs must have gone on for quite some time. Mudjāhid, at the end of the first Islamic century (d.104/722) to whom much important exegetical activity is ascribed by the Islamic tradition, is nevertheless known by his epithet *al-Muqrrī*, ‘the teacher of recitation’.

The stores of such explanatory glosses grew gradually and came to be written down. Mudjāhid himself is quoted by tradition as having come with his *alwāḥ* or tablets<sup>15</sup> to his teacher, Ibn ʿAbbās, on whose command he wrote down what was explained to him.<sup>16</sup> And so writing became an important means to preserve the ever

---

<sup>13</sup> Mentioned in the author’s introduction in: al-Ṭabarī, *Djāmiʿ al-bayān fī taʾwīl āy al-qurʾān*, eds. Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir, Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo 1954—not completed), vol.1, 80 (trad. 81) and ff. for similar traditions. N.B.: In the new complete edition in 12 vols. by Dār al-kutub al-ʿilmiyya: *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī al-musammā djāmiʿ al-bayān fī taʾwīl al-qurʾān* (Beirut 1992), which seems to be based on the Shākir edition, the same numbering of traditions is used. Cf. the English translation, J. Cooper, *The commentary on the Qurʾān by Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī* (Oxford 1987) vol.1, 35-37.

<sup>14</sup> Al-Ṭabarī (as in n.13) vol.1, 81 (trad. 87), transl. 36.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. “Lawḥ”, *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (as in n.3) vol.5, 698.

<sup>16</sup> Al-Ṭabarī (as in n.13) vol.1, 90 (trad. 107).

growing store of explanations. Owing to the lack of independent source material, we do not know exactly how the process evolved from sporadic oral glosses, recorded orally in the course of recitation training, to an independent exegetical discipline depending on the collection and correct transmission of written material.

However, there is sufficient evidence to support the reconstruction presented here. In this reconstruction I differ from the views of Sezgin, who maintained that as early as in the first generation after Mohammed written commentaries had been composed, and from Wansbrough, who on stylistic and typological grounds proposed a later and different development. In addition to the arguments advanced elsewhere by the present writer,<sup>17</sup> yet other arguments for the above-mentioned reconstruction of the history of early *tafsīr* have been advanced by Claude Giliot.<sup>18</sup>

A word must now be said about the supposed early opposition to Koranic exegesis. The question of early opposition to the exegetical practice was raised by Goldziher, refuted by Birkeland, affirmed again by Abbott, only to be again rejected by the present writer and later by Giliot. On the basis of a new analysis of a critical story in this respect, the story of Ṣabīgh ibn ʿIsl who was punished by the caliph ʿUmar, allegedly for interpreting the Koran, it can be maintained that early—and for that matter also later—opposition to exegesis had everything to do with the use of exegesis to undermine the political authority of the caliph.<sup>19</sup> It is not unreasonable to suppose that such a motive is behind the general disapproval of the so-called *tafsīr bil-raʾy* or exegesis that is based only on the exercise of one's own reasoning. Thus we find time and again that exegetical work of people like ʿIkrima, who was a Khāridjite, and Muḥammad ibn al-Sāʾib al-Kalbī, who had Shīʿite tendencies, was discredited, notwithstanding the fact that these men were considered to be important pupils of Ibn ʿAbbās himself. In this respect it is noteworthy that a disqualification of the kind of Koranic exegesis that could be considered to undermine the legitimacy of sunnite authority seems

---

<sup>17</sup> See F. Leemhuis, "Origins and Early Development of the *tafsīr* Tradition", in: A. Rippin (ed.), *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qurʾān* (Oxford 1988) 14-30.

<sup>18</sup> C. Giliot, "Les débuts de l'exégèse coranique", *Les premières écritures islamiques* = *Revue du Monde Musulman et de la Méditerranée* 58 (Aix-en-Provence 1990) 82-100.

<sup>19</sup> Giliot, *Les débuts* (as in n.18) 84-85; Leemhuis, *Origins* (as in n.17) 16-19.

to have remained a constant. It is, e.g., stated very clearly by al-Zarkashī at the end of the eighth/fourteenth century in his compendium of Koranic learning:

Exegesis that conflicts with verse and Law is forbidden, because it is the exegesis of ignorants (*taʿwīl al-djāhilīn*) such as the interpretation by the Rāfiḍites (a Shīʿite sect) of the Koranic verse (sura 55, *al-Raḥmān*: 19): “He let forth the two seas to meet together” that they are ‘Alī and Fāṭima and that in (same sura, verse 22): “Come forth from them are the pearl and the coral” al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain are meant . . .<sup>20</sup>

Also another type of *tafsīr*-activity was frowned upon by authorities around the beginning of the second Islamic century, the so-called *tafsīr al-qaum*. By this is meant a commentary and exegesis that could be called popular, in the sense of uncontrolled storytelling and without mention of the sources—in other words, liable to originate from the wildest fantasies. It may be said in passing that the one important example of such a *tafsīr* that has survived and has been published, the one of Muqātil ibn Sulaimān,<sup>21</sup> is a very interesting source indeed for an early popular Islam which, perhaps, at the time of its composition was not yet divorced from orthodoxy. Anyhow, try as orthodoxy would, it could not eradicate the popular stories; they kept coming back as illustrations to the Koranic lectionary, becoming ever more firmly attached by a reliable chain of transmitters to a trustworthy authority; as a result of this, the wilder flights of imagination were at least temporarily banned. But a general opposition to Koranic exegesis as such seems to have been out of the question, as the material we have at our disposal appears to tell us.

Anyhow, in what is perhaps the most probable history of the mainstream of *tafsīr*, the number of explained words and passages gradually increased during about two or three generations, although this remained embedded in a living, not yet fixed, tradition. This means that the store of explanations was guarded and transmitted by the successive generations, but that it was also supplemented as long as it was considered by them to be in accordance with what each generation had been taught. In this respect it is not relevant whether

<sup>20</sup> Badr al-dīn al-Zarkashī, *Al-burhān fī ʿulūm al-qurʾān* (Beirut 19722) vol.2, 152; cf. Naṣr Abū Zaid, *Maṭhum* (as in n.7) 265.

<sup>21</sup> *Tafsīr Muqātil ibn Sulaimān*, ed. by ʿAbdallāh Maḥmūd Shaḥāta (Cairo 1979-1989).

at an early time separate lists of explanatory glosses to the Koran were already in circulation, because if this is so, they certainly were not seen as finite.

From the available sources we can infer that a number of such circles of transmission must have existed in the latter half of the first and the beginning of the second Islamic century.<sup>22</sup> They cherished comparable but not identical stores of lexical and paraphrastic glosses to the Koran. These stores gradually began to be supplemented also with some narrative material, especially for identification purposes—such as the statement that “the servants of Ours, men of great might” in sura 17, *al-Isrāʾ*: 4-7 who were sent to punish the Israelites were both times an army from Persia under Nebuchadnezzar’s command. This at least is the version according to the material that was available to the circle of Mudjāhid’s successors. In another circle a slightly different version arose; this found its redaction in ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s version of Ma‘mar’s *tafsīr* teaching where we find that the first time it was Goliath, and only the second time Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>23</sup>

In the beginning of the second/eighth century individual authors started to compose books that contained their store of Koranic interpretations, whether it was mainly from one traditional circle—as in the case of the pupils of Ibn Abi Nadjīh, who had been the pupil of Mudjāhid,—or from different circles—as in the case of Sufyān al-Thaurī. Of course they knew where the material they recorded came from and so, one generation later, their pupils had no problem transmitting their material according to the rules that had become firmly established by then: proper *isnāds*, chains of transmitters, were added to the individual comments that were recorded. Consequently, within one or two generations the character of *tafsīr* changed, and

---

<sup>22</sup> Some of those can be identified as being connected with the redactions of their *tafsīr* tradition that occurred around the middle of the second Islamic century: the Ibn Abi Nadjīh ‘an Mudjāhid tradition, the Sufyān al-Thaurī tradition and the ‘Abd al-Razzāq ‘an Ma‘mar tradition. These *tafsīrs* are available in more or less critical editions: *Tafsīr Mudjāhid*, ed. by ‘Abd-al-Rahmān al-Tāhir ibn Muḥammad al-Sūrātī (Islamabad 1976, repr. Beirut n.d.), *Tafsīr al-imām Mudjāhid ibn Djabr*, ed. by Muḥammad ‘Abd-al-Salām Abū al-Nīl (Cairo 1989), *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān al-Karīm lil-imām Abī ‘Abdallāh Sufyān ibn Saʿīd ibn Masruq al-Thaurī al-Kūfī*, ed. by Imtiyāz ‘Alī ‘Arshī (Rampur 1965, repr. Beirut [without some of the indices] 1983) and *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān lil-imām ‘Abd-al-Razzāq ibn Hishām al-Šanʿānī*, ed. by Muṣṭafā Muslim Muḥammad (Riyadh 1989).

<sup>23</sup> In both cases *ad loc.*

around the middle of the second Islamic century the first step to an independent branch of learning was taken. This fixed the different traditional stores of Koranic commentary in writing and the next step, one generation later, made this commentary respectable by making it adhere to the rules of the game of traditionalist learning.

Once this latter step was taken the way was open to include all kinds of materials, juridical and narrative for example, but also material that was trustworthily transmitted from one authority that conflicted with the view of another that had also been trustworthily transmitted. Even conflicting views of the same authority, but differently transmitted, could be recorded. All the same, in the classical Islamic view, the reliability of a message, of course, depended very much on the trustworthiness of the transmitter, and so, in order to judge the trustworthiness of transmitters, a whole branch of learning, namely the collection of biographical material on them, appeared. This science, in which the reports of trustworthy people concerning others played an important part, became more and more the collection of the *communis opinio* of orthodoxy. However, although in that way many sheep were separated from the goats, many conflicts and inconsistencies remained. In fact, their number grew. From the late second and early third Islamic century onward, *tafsīr* material of different kinds, that could be considered authoritative on the basis of a sound *isnād*, was collected more and more into compilatory *tafsīrs*, in which conflicting material more often than not was simply juxtaposed, leaving the reader to decide.

At the same time, more developed notions of grammar, syntax, and style stimulated the origin of more technical monographs on the textual difficulties of the Koran. To explain or elucidate these commentators also resorted to ancient poetry and secular theories of rhetoric if need be. Apparently, the need for this kind of expertise was acknowledged, so that towards the end of the third century we see that a thorough technical knowledge of Arabic becomes accepted as a kind of a decisive factor in Koranic exegesis. To sum it up in the words of al-Ṭabarī, the great commentator who marks the end of what one could call the period of traditionalist, compiled *tafsīr* and the beginning of its classical period:

We have spoken earlier in this book about the aspects of interpreting the Koran and that the interpretation of the entire Koran may be categorised into three groups: One is inaccessible; it is the one which is known only to God and which He has concealed from all His

creatures. It concerns the times of things that will come to pass, which God has announced in His Book that they are imminent, such as the time of the final hour, the time of the coming down of Jesus, son of Mary, the time of the appearance of the sun in the West, the blowing of the last trumpet and similar things. The second category is the one of which God bestowed the knowledge of its interpretation specifically to His Prophet and to no one else in his community. The interpretation of what is contained in this category God's servants need to know, but its knowledge is only accessible through the explanation of its interpretation given to them by the Messenger of God. And the third is what is known to the people who have knowledge of the language in which the Koran was sent down and that consists of knowledge of the interpretation of its Arabicity and its desinential inflection.<sup>24</sup>

This is, in brief and in his own words, al-Ṭabarī's hermeneutical position. It is a remarkable position, in that he explicitly gave the discipline of Arabic studies in a wide sense a place in Koranic interpretation alongside all that had been trustworthily transmitted from the Prophet in the sphere of God's commands and prohibitions. In al-Ṭabarī's view, as becomes clear from other passages, the parts of the Koran of which the interpretation is known only to God are very few indeed. And so the correct commentator is the one who, in the case of the juridical contents of the Koran, resorts to the *sunna* of the Prophet and for the rest takes care to give his view on the basis of a sound knowledge of Arabic and of what has been transmitted from the earlier authorities.

What it meant in practice, of course, is that from then on the activity of Koranic interpretation not only meant extensively collecting traditional and linguistic material from the time of the Prophet and shortly after, but also arranging and judging all that material in a convincing way. This might be done by giving some authorities more weight than others, by concluding that some chains of transmitters are less trustworthy than others, by demonstrating that a transmitted explanation is in accordance with or contravenes the rules of Arabic grammar or the Arabic idiom as expressed in ancient poetry, etc., etc. Thus, the commentator on the Koran was like a judge, who collects or has collected for him all the available evidence, who decides about the admissibility of the evidence according

---

<sup>24</sup> Al-Ṭabarī (as in n.13) vol.1, 92, transl. 40. The fuller version is on 73ff., transl. 32-34. See also J. Dammen McAuliffe, "Quranic Hermeneutics: The Views of al-Ṭabarī and Ibn Kathīr", in: A. Rippin (ed.), *Approaches to the History of the Interpretation of the Qurʾān* (Oxford 1988) 48-50.

to well-established rules, who applies the right criteria to measure the strength of the evidence, and then pronounces his judgment, while presenting the public with the argumentation that led him to his judgment. The commentator should certainly not use only his own personal opinion. Al-Ṭabarī warns, in accordance with the orthodox norm that seems to have been established by his time:

that it is not permitted for anyone to interpret according to his own personal opinion those verses of the Koran whose interpretation can only be known through a text reporting the explanation of God's Messenger, or through an indication of it by him. Indeed, whoever expresses his own opinion on this will be at fault in what he does, even if he thereby attains the truth, for the very reason of having expressed his own opinion. For his conclusion will not be that of someone who is sure that he is right, only that of someone who guesses and follows his own surmise; and whoever speaks about God's religion according to his own surmise, speaks concerning God what he does not know.<sup>25</sup>

Subjective exegesis had no place in orthodoxy. The good commentator should objectify his exegesis by means of the collection of the relevant data and the mastery of the accepted tools to deal with them. Thus, the quest for knowledge was viewed in the first place as the collection of authoritative knowledge from others, from elsewhere. Had not the Prophet already recommended seeking for knowledge even in China? That there were other views on the quest of knowledge, directed more internally or rationally, is well-known. That these views were and are frowned upon by orthodoxy is equally well-known and will surprise no one in the light of the above-mentioned outline of al-Ṭabarī's principles of Koranic exegesis. These, fundamentally, have remained accepted by orthodoxy till today, with, it should be added, the explicit addition of a principle which is implicitly present in al-Ṭabarī's *tafsīr*. This is stated some four centuries later in the answer of Ibn Kathīr (who recycled much of the material of al-Ṭabarī) in relation to the question, "what is the best of the methods for *tafsīr*?" : " . . . the best procedure is 'to interpret the Qur'ān by the Qur'ān' ."<sup>26</sup>

The attitude of dealing with the holy text by means of a whole array of other texts that were recognised as authoritative, had one important external aspect: The compilation and copying of written

<sup>25</sup> Al-Ṭabarī (as in n.13) vol.1, 79; cf. English transl. 35.

<sup>26</sup> Dammen McAuliffe, *Quranic Hermeneutics* (as in n.24) 56.



material was greatly encouraged by it. al-Ṭabarī collected in his *tafsīr* more than 38.000 *ḥadīth*/traditions; the virtually complete manuscript in the Egyptian National library consists of 23 volumes, and the latest printed edition of more than 7500 pages. As such it was and is not exceptional: religious learning in the orthodox sense had become first and foremost recording—to the joy of the paper trade, one might conclude.

## ARABIC DIDACTIC VERSE

GEERT JAN VAN GELDER

In order to prepare himself for entering al-Azhar, the famous Egyptian man of letters, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn (1889-1973), at the tender age of eleven or twelve, had to memorise the *Alfiyya*, a versified Arabic grammar of a thousand lines of doggerel, written by the thirteenth-century Ibn Mālik. In his autobiographical novel *al-Ayyām* ('The Days')<sup>1</sup> Ṭāhā Ḥusayn describes his initial rapture, which soon gave way to despair ('at last he reached the chapter on the Cognate Accusative and then he could not make any progress at all'); but after this false start at the Religious Law Court he learnt it by heart in ten days at home, supervised by his elder brother. The Azhar, mosque-cum-university, was only one of the many centres of learning in the Arab, and, indeed, most of the Muslim world, where the *Alfiyya* and various similar texts served as a starting-point for a scholarly career. Famous texts attract scholars just as do famous colleges and universities; thus the *Alfiyya* was itself a centre of learning, since it gave rise to dozens of commentaries and supercommentaries, some of them massive. Given the paramount role of memorisation in traditional Muslim teaching and scholarship,<sup>2</sup> it is not surprising that the genre of didactic verse was popular in all centres of learning and teaching: home, school, mosque or college. The mobility of medieval Arab scholars was rather higher than today and many travelled from centre to centre; a case in point is the already-mentioned Ibn Mālik who was born in Jaén in Spain, lived mainly in Damascus but also taught in Aleppo and Hamah. The mobility of standard texts was even greater, because unlike their authors they are able to multiply themselves and live on for centuries.

Among the production centres of such texts Cairo and Damascus must rank very high; it seems likely that they surpass Baghdad in this respect, since the leading role of Baghdad, in both political and

---

<sup>1</sup> The first part has been translated, as *An Egyptian Childhood*, by E.H. Paxton (London 1932, repr. 1981); see 33-39.

<sup>2</sup> On which see e.g. G. Makdisi, *The Rise of Humanism in Classical Islam and the Christian West, with special reference to Scholasticism* (Edinburgh 1990) 202-207.

scholarly affairs, declined greatly in the thirteenth century, partly as the result of the Mongol invasion, just at a time when didactic verse became a popular instrument in teaching. But the genre was by no means unknown before that time; no doubt it arose originally in Arabic in one of the three great centres of early Arabic scholarship: Kufa, Basra and Baghdad. Among the earliest authors of what might be called Arabic didactic verse was the theologian Bishr Ibn al-Muṭamir (d.825), who was possibly born in the first of these towns, but was active mainly in the other two.

The modest aim of this contribution is to give a brief survey of the genre of didactic verse in classical Arabic literary history. This may seem rather superfluous, seeing that a recent work of reference contains a chapter that sets out to do precisely this.<sup>3</sup> However, this chapter is marred by a confusion concerning the concept of didactic verse. Let us look at the beginning of the chapter:

Arabic didactic verse (*shiʿr taʿlīmī*) aims solely at teaching a particular genre of knowledge.

This is fine, apart from the fact that the author should have told us, here or afterwards, that the Arabic term *shiʿr taʿlīmī* is a recent and accurate translation of ‘didactic verse’ (or its French equivalent) and is not found in classical Arabic literature, where there was in fact no generally recognised term for ‘didactic verse’, which might indicate that the Arabs perhaps lacked a well-defined idea as to what is or is not didactic verse. Of course the Arabs had something that may be called ‘didactic verse’, but it does not do to apply modern terms to ancient phenomena without a word of caution. I cite the following sentences:

Many Arab critics do not regard it as true poetry, since it is devoid of emotion and imagination, both of which are essential constituents of poetry, besides metre and rhyme. In other words, they consider it as versified prose.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ṣafāʾ Khulūṣī, ‘Didactic Verse’, in: M.J.L. Young, J.D. Latham, R.B. Serjeant (eds.), *Religion, Learning and Science in the ‘Abbasid Period*, The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature, vol.3, (Cambridge 1990) 498-509, bibliography 548. There are a few other, much shorter, general surveys of Arabic didactic verse: M. Ullmann, *Untersuchungen zur Rağazpoesie* (Wiesbaden 1966) 57-59; G. Endress, ‘Das Lehrgedicht’, in: H. Gätje (ed.), *Grundriss der Arabischen Philologie*, Bd. II: *Literaturwissenschaft* (Wiesbaden 1987) 471-473.

I will not quarrel with this: if by 'it' we understand the typical versified knowledge that we now call 'didactic verse', then we may indeed find such statements by the ancient critics, who tended to ignore this kind of poetry in their theoretical and critical works. Incidentally, I do not think that 'emotion' is what these critics, unlike some modern ones, were looking for in so-called 'true' poetry, but this is a minor point. The author, Ṣafā' Khulūṣī, continues:

Didactic verse is instructive, adding to one's knowledge and aiming at improving one's morals. It pleases the ear and aids the memory.

This seems to imply that all didactic verse aims at improving one's morals, which is certainly not true. A hint of a paradox is contained in the words "It pleases the ear", since we have just been told that it is devoid of emotion and imagination, and that it "aims solely at teaching". I suppose the mere presence of metre and rhyme is sufficiently pleasing. After this, the author points out that the Arabs were influenced by the Greeks and the Indians, which is likely enough. Subsequently, the various categories of Arabic didactic verse are given under the following four headings:

- 1 Epigrammatic and gnomic verses . . . that date back to the time of the Jāhiliyyah [i.e. pre-Islamic times, vG], for which Zuhayr b. abī Sulmā, al-Nābigha al-Dhubyānī (d.604) and Labid b. Rabī'ah were well known.
- 2 Fables, parables, songs, riddles, maxims, proverbs, monologues and dialogues, particularly of the 'Abbāsīd era . . .
- 3 Theological, medical and grammatical treatises which cover a wide range, for example, the *Alfiyyah* of Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Mālīk, 1,000 verses in *rajaz* metre to help students to learn by heart the intricacies of Arabic grammar.
- 4 Verses that are not primarily didactic, but are none the less instructive. Much Arabic verse falls within this category, such as Abū 'l-Ṭayyib Aḥmad al-Mutanabbī's odes descriptive of the campaigns of Sayf al-Dawlah.

This list is utterly misleading in the light of the preceding. For it would follow that all four kinds, including the poetry of Zuhayr, al-Nābigha and al-Mutanabbī, as well as much gnomic verse, were not regarded as true poetry by the old critics, and were devoid of emotion and imagination. Nothing could be further from the truth, or from the author's intention. The author seems to employ two wholly different senses of the word didactic. In a broad sense, virtually all serious Arabic poetry, and even much unserious poetry, may be

called didactic to some extent. But it is only the third category in Khulūṣī's list that is properly called didactic verse. It may be that the author, an Arab, wanted to enhance his list in order to stress the high quality of didactic verse in Arabic literature, which was not to be outdone by Greek and Latin literature with their Hesiod, Lucretius, Virgil and others. But whatever stars may shine in the firmament of Arabic poetry, they are no Hesiods, Lucretiuses or Virgils. The confusion in Khulūṣī's chapter is not confined to the first page, for later on<sup>4</sup> we find a list of poets who, according to him, wrote didactic verse, ranging from pre-Islamic times (Zuhayr, Ṭarafa et al.) through the 'Abbasid period (Abū Tammām, al-Mutanabbī, al-Ma'arrī) to the twentieth century (Jibrān Khalīl Jibrān). None of these poets wrote any true didactic verse of the kind that is the subject of this paper.

This is not to say that the distinction between 'true' didactic verse and other genres is always clear-cut, as I shall demonstrate by means of a few examples of various types. The clearest type is that which Khulūṣī mentions as his third category: versified science. There are thousands of Arabic poems, especially from the later Middle Ages, that set out to comprehend a particular field of learning, a branch of science, within a few hundred or several thousand lines of verse. Almost any subject could be, and was, versified: dogmatics, the law of inheritance, medicine, astronomy, history, rhetoric, prosody, calligraphy, the explication of dreams, algebra, bloodletting, logic, navigation, agriculture, sexual intercourse, alchemy, jurisprudence, Koranic sciences, the use of toothpicks—the list might easily be extended. Incidentally, not all didactic verse in this category is of treatise-length, as Khulūṣī suggests: we also find short mnemotechnic rhymes of merely a few lines, that conveniently bring together a number of related terms or concepts, for example the lunar mansions, or the various gaits of horse or camel, or the names of the fingers and the distances between them as units of measurement.<sup>5</sup>

All these poems employ the prosodical conventions of traditional Arabic poetry. They are written in one of the recognised classical

---

<sup>4</sup> Khulūṣī, *Didactic Verse* (as in n.3) 102.

<sup>5</sup> Many such poems were composed, and incorporated in his *Majma' al-baḥrayn*, by Nāṣif al-Yāziji (d.1871), see ed. Beirut, n.d., 24-26, 47-48, 58-60, 92, 100-101, 131-133, 165-167, 174-176, 188-189, 204-205, 213, 220-221, 233-235, 254-255, 258-259.

metres, very often in the metre called *rajaz*, which is the simplest and most pliable of them all, each line consisting of a number of feet (normally three) that are basically composed of four syllables of which the third is always short, the fourth always long, and the first and second either short or long: not unlike the Greek or Latin iambic trimeter, therefore. It is a metre that among true poets has a somewhat lower status than the others, but in the case of didactic verse this is no longer relevant. However, didactic poems employing more complicated metres are not at all rare. Traditionally, Arabic poetry is characterised by monorhyme: all lines of a poem, even long poems of over one hundred lines, must have the same rhyme. In Arabic, this is not particularly difficult, but in the case of very long poems it becomes a problem.<sup>6</sup> Almost all didactic poems of hundreds or thousands of lines are therefore written in paired rhyme: *aabbccdd* . . . , which allows one to go on indefinitely. The origin of this technique of paired rhyme is not wholly clear. It became popular, it seems, in the late eighth century, in what may be called forerunners of true didactic verse, such as the versification of prose fables by Abān al-Lāḥiqī<sup>7</sup> or the collection of gnomic verse by Abū l-ʿAtāhiya;<sup>8</sup> whether or not it came from Persia will not concern us here.<sup>9</sup>

The combination of the two predominant techniques of paired rhyme and *rajaz* metre results in the didactic form *par excellence*, called *urjūza*.<sup>10</sup> Why were they made? There are many nearly incredible but well-attested reports concerning the phenomenal retentive powers of the memory of medieval Arabs.<sup>11</sup> Many were apparently

---

<sup>6</sup> Not always: al-Nāshīʾ al-akbar (d.906), poet and theologian, reputedly composed a 4000-line didactic poem in monorhyme on various subjects, cf. al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj al-dhahab/Les prairies d'or*, ed. Barbier de Meynard et Pavet de Courteille, revue et corrigée par Charles Pellat, IV (Beirut 1973) 337.

<sup>7</sup> S.M. Stern, "Abān b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Lāḥiqī", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden 1960- ); Ullmann, *Untersuchungen* (as in n.3) 50-51; Khulūṣī, *Didactic Verse* (as in n.3) 499-500.

<sup>8</sup> See below, n.21.

<sup>9</sup> See G.E. von Grunebaum, "On the origin and early development of Arabic *muzdawij* poetry", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 3 (1944) 9-13, repr. in his *Islam and Medieval Hellenism* (London 1976); Ullmann, *Untersuchungen* (as in n.3), esp. 46-60.

<sup>10</sup> Every poem in *rajaz* metre, whether didactic or not, whether in monorhyme or paired rhyme, may be called *urjūza*.

<sup>11</sup> Surprisingly, Makdisi, *The Rise of Humanism* (as in n.2) ignores the role of didactic verse in his Part Five ('Instruction: the methodology of learning', 202-229).

able to memorise bulky works in prose; but metre and rhyme must have facilitated the task of memorizing. One did not have to be a great poet to produce a didactic poem in *urjūza* form—this is painfully obvious in many instances. In any case, stylistic excellence was not pursued; on the contrary, it is clear that it was deliberately avoided because it would distract from the substance of the poem. Especially since the time that the *madrasa* flourished throughout the Arabo-Islamic world, i.e. from the twelfth century onward, didactic verse was a widespread instrument in the scholastic tradition. The subject matter could conveniently be compressed, often in highly condensed form, in the space of a relatively short text. This means that, rather paradoxically, many such poems are far from being didactic in the modern sense of the word, if by ‘didactic’ we mean something that introduces a pupil gradually to a certain field of knowledge, teaching him not merely facts or how to apply certain rules automatically, but also making him understand the facts and how they hang together. It is obvious that many an *urjūza* is not so much an introduction to be presented to beginners as an *aide-mémoire*, a handy compendium for those who have already mastered all or most of the subject. In spite of this, it seems that until quite recent times young students were confronted with precisely such poems, to be learned by rote without much, or any, understanding at first. The surprising thing is that this seemed to have worked in many cases. Many *urjūzas* are so obscure, in fact, that they invite commentators; consequently, there is an extensive body of commentaries and supercommentaries surrounding many famous didactic poems.<sup>12</sup>

In the following I should like to present a few specimens, some mere fragments, of various types of Arabic didactic verse. Ibn Mālik’s *Alfiyya*, mentioned before, could serve as an example of the most typical kind of didactic poem. After a short proem it begins its subject, Arabic syntax, as follows:

---

<sup>12</sup> For a study of the way in which learning may be moulded into verse, see J.N. Mattock, “The Medical Muse”, paper presented at the 16th Congress of the Union Européenne d’Arabisants et d’Islamisés (Salamanca, 27 August–2 September 1992), which deals with an *urjūza* attributed to Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna) that is obviously based on one particular work in prose which has fortunately been preserved, the Arabic version of the pseudo-Hippocratic treatise *De pustulis et epistematibus significantibus mortem*.

- 8 *Kalāmūnā lafẓun mufīdun ka-staqīm*  
*wa-smun wa-fiʿlun thumma ḥarfuni l-kalīm*  
 9 *Wāḥiduhū kalīmatun wa-l-qawlu ʿamm*  
*wa-kilmātun biḥā kalāmūn qad yuʿamm*  
 10 *Bi-l-jarri wa-l-tanwīnī wa-l-nidā wa-al*  
*wa-musnadīn lil-ismi tamyīzun ḥaṣal*

Meaningful Utterance is *Speech*, like “Teach!”

And *Noun, Verb, Particle*: the *Parts of Speech*.

The unit: *Word*; *Discourse*: the whole Extent,

Although at times with “Word” a *Speech* is meant.

A *Noun* is known by *al-* or by *Nunation*,

*Vocative, Genitive* or *Predication*.<sup>13</sup>

I have translated Arabic doggerel into English doggerel; the only freedom I have taken is the replacement of Ibn Mālīk’s example, literally “Be upright!”, by another imperative; both Ibn Mālīk and I were led by the exigence of rhyme. I have not succeeded in reproducing faithfully the rather warped and tortuous word order of the original. Ibn Mālīk managed to compress the rather complex rules of Arabic syntax into one thousand couplets, and this idea, though not original, was brilliantly executed. Yet, as Sidney Glazer says,

many of the qualities that won for it the admiration of specialists made it quite useless in the unassisted hands of elementary students. Conciseness verging on obscurity, extremely broad and occasionally faulty generalisations, inevitable ambiguities, paucity of illustrations—all these rendered the need of a detailed commentary fairly acute.<sup>14</sup>

Such a commentary—one of many—was written by the Andalusian-Arabic grammarian Abū Ḥayyān (1256-1344, born in Granada, active in Tunisia, Alexandria, the Hejaz and especially Cairo), who severely criticised Ibn Mālīk’s procedure. The poem, he says, suffers from mistakes and padding, at least partly as a result of the form:

A versifier is often forced by rhyme and metre to stray from the easy road and to walk the rough path, and to express a simple idea by means of a far-fetched expression, or (to express) a smooth and plain concept in a complex and figurative manner.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Ibn Mālīk, *Alfiyya. Carmen didacticum grammaticum*. . . , ed. Fr. Dieterici (Leipzig 1851) 2-3. In the last couplet, *al-* is, of course, the Arabic definite article; “nunation” is the Arabo-Latin technical term for the ending *-n*, a mark of indefiniteness.

<sup>14</sup> *Manhaj as-Sālik: Abū Ḥayyān’s Commentary of the Alfiyya of Ibn Mālīk*, ed. with introd. by S. Glazer (New Haven 1947) xxiv-xxv.

<sup>15</sup> Abū Ḥayyān, *Manhaj* (as in n.14) 1.



Other didactic poems, however, do not deal with complex material. They only need to be memorised and do not require commentaries. Take, for instance, the poem that al-Suyūṭī (d.1505) wrote at the end of his *History of the Caliphs*, by way of summary. It consists of 115 lines, not in *rajaz* metre but the rather more complex *basīṭ*, and not in paired rhyme but in monorhyme: all lines end in *-rā*. This does not mean that the poem is more ‘literary’ than *urjūzas* in paired rhyme. It is full of dull formulas: twenty lines begin with *wa-qāma min ba‘dihī* ‘After him reigned . . .’, ten other lines begin with slight variations on this formula, sixteen other lines begin with *thumma* ‘Next . . .’. Here follows a fragment:

- 36 *Wa-ba‘dahū qāma Marwānu l-ḥimāru wa-fī*  
*thintayni ba‘da thalāthīna l-dimā‘u jarā*  
*Wa-qāma min ba‘dihī l-Saffāḥu thumma qaḍā*  
*ba‘da l-thalāthīna fī sittin wa-qad judirā*  
*Wa-qāma min ba‘dihī l-Manṣūru thummata fī*  
*khamṣīna ba‘da thamānin muḥriman qubirā*  
*Wa-hwa lladhī khaṣṣa a‘mālan mawāliyahū*  
*wa-ahmala l-‘urba ḥattā amruhum datharā*  
 40 *Thumma bnuhū wa-huwa l-Mahdiyyu māta ladā*  
*tis‘in wa-sittīna masmūman kamā dhukirā*  
*Thumma bnuhū wa-huwa l-Hādī wa-mawtatuhū*  
*fī ‘āmi sab‘īna lammā hamma an ghadarā*  
*Thumma l-Rashīdu . . .*

- 36 And after him reigned Marwān, the Donkey [so called on account of his tireless war efforts]. In ’32 [i.e. AH 132 = AD 749-50] blood flowed [referring to the ‘Abbāsid revolution].

After him reigned al-Saffāḥ. Then in ’36 [754] he died, having caught smallpox.

After him reigned al-Manṣūr; then, in ’58 [775] he was buried, while on pilgrimage.

He is the one who appointed his [non-Arab] clients in office, and ignored the Arabs, so that their power dwindled.

- 40 Then his son, viz. al-Mahdī, who died in ’68 [785]—poisoned, as they say.

Then his son, viz. al-Hādī, whose death occurred in the year ’70 [786], when he was about to act treacherously [trying to exclude his brother Hārūn, designated by al-Mahdī, from the succession].

Then [Hārūn] al-Rashīd . . .<sup>16</sup>

<sup>16</sup> al-Suyūṭī, *Tārīkh al-khulafā’*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī l-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (Beirut 1988) 588-589.

The language is almost like that of prose, except that in the original the dates could only be forced into metrical verse by means of clumsy circumlocutions, not imitated in the translation: "in two after thirty", "after thirty, in six", "in fifty after eight". It is obvious why medieval literary theorists and critics, preoccupied as they were with the subtleties of tropes and figures and with the refined and original expression of traditional or novel motifs, were utterly uninterested in this genre. The fragment quoted above, which is representative of many similar historical poems, is devoid of the flowers of rhetoric and manages to compress an extremely important and exciting period of forty years of history into some six dull lines without narrative merit, with a few factual details, most of them without much significance and thrown in for the sake of variety or as metrical fillers. Providing a convenient rhyme seems to be the only function of the smallpox in line 37. However, when memorised such poems were undoubtedly useful in providing a framework of political history.

As was said above, there is no clear dividing-line between the strictly didactic genre and those poems that are to some extent didactic as well as literary, or poems that are first and foremost literary and only didactic in the sense that any good poetry contains something from which one may learn. However, the lack of clear boundaries does not mean, of course, that one is justified in lumping together all these different genres, as if the occasional hermaphrodite would invalidate the distinction between male and female. As always, the borderline cases are among the more interesting. There are, for instance, some long historical poems with literary pretensions, such as the *urjūza* by the Abbasid prince and poet Ibn al-Muʿtazz (d.908) on the life of his cousin, the caliph al-Muʿtaḍid,<sup>17</sup> and that of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih (d.940) on the exploits of the Cordovan caliph ʿAbd al-Raḥmān III.<sup>18</sup> Rather than didactic, however, they are panegyric, as is immediately apparent not merely from what

<sup>17</sup> Ibn al-Muʿtazz, *Diwān*, ed. Muḥammad Badīʿ Sharīf (Cairo 1977-78) ii, 5-29; ed. and transl. by C. Lang, *ZDMG* 40 (1886) 536-611, 41 (1887) 232-279.

<sup>18</sup> Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, *al-ʿIqd al-farīd* (Cairo 1948-53) iv, 501-527; J.T. Monroe, *Hispano-Arabic poetry: a student anthology* (Berkeley etc. 1974) 74-129 (text and translation); idem, "The historical *arjūza* [sic] of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, a tenth-century Hispano-Arabic epic poem", *JAOS* 91 (1971) 67-95. See on the genre of the historical *urjūza* also B. Reinert, "Die Anfänge des spanisch-arabischen Epos", *Saeculum* 29 (1978) 231-268; F. Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden 1968, 2nd rev. ed.) 179-185, 546.

they say but even more from how they say it, by means of the conventional poetic vocabulary, idiom, tropes and figures of speech. They belong, not to centres of learning, but to the court.

A borderline case, too, is the rather early and fascinating mixture of literary and didactic aspects in a couple of poems by the Muʿtazilite theologian Bishr Ibn al-Muʿtamir (d.825). They are quoted in the great book on animals by his younger contemporary al-Jāhiz (d.868-9), who also provides a commentary.<sup>19</sup> Al-Jāhiz incorporates the poems, as he says, for various reasons: for the sake of memorisation, because they may serve as a source for proverbial quotations, and since they provide al-Jāhiz with a framework upon which he can structure the relevant parts of his own book.<sup>20</sup> Bishr's aim is to show God's wonderful creation, and more in particular the fact that animals are in many ways wiser than humans. These poems are full of zoological facts, yet they are not straightforward didactic poems.

Another poem that is sometimes called didactic, or a forerunner of the didactic genre, is a very boring poem, again an *urjūza* in paired rhyme, by Abū l-ʿAtāhiya (d.825 or 826) which consists of an unstructured collection of gnomic lines.<sup>21</sup> Here is a specimen:

*Mā ntafaʿa l-marʿu bi-mithli ʿaqlihī*  
*Wa-khayru dhukhri l-marʿi ḥusnu fiʿlihī*  
*Inna l-fasāda ʿidduhu l-ṣalāḥū*  
*Wa-rubba jiddin jarrahu l-muzāḥū*  
*Man jaʿala l-nammāma ʿaynan halakā*  
*Mublighuka l-sharra ka-bāghihī lakā*  
*Inna l-shabāba wa-l-farāgha wa-l-jidāh*  
*Mafsadatun lil-marʿi ayyu mafsadah*

<sup>19</sup> al-Jāhiz, *al-Hayawān*, ed. ʿAbd al-Salām Muḥammad Hārūn (Cairo 1965-69) vi, 284-297; the commentary (interrupted by digressions) vi, 297-443. On Bishr Ibn al-Muʿtamir—who is not mentioned as a poet in Ullmann's book on *rajaz* (above n.3) nor in F. Sezgin's volume on poets in his *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* II (Leiden 1975)—see J. van Ess, *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra. Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam* III (Berlin 1992) 107-130 (on the poems, see 109-112) and V (1993) 286-299 (German translation with annotation). Bishr wrote many poems on theological subjects only the titles of which are known; it seems that the majority were polemical rather than didactic.

<sup>20</sup> al-Jāhiz, *Hayawān* (as in n.19) vi, 284.

<sup>21</sup> Abū l-ʿAtāhiya, *Ashʿāruh wa-akhbārūh*, ed. Shukrī Fayṣal (Damascus 1965) 444-465 (320 lines); according to Abū l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, *al-Aghānī* (Cairo 1927-1974) iv, 36-37, it reputedly consisted of 4000 lines (a customary indication of a large number, cf. above n.6).

'Tis not his *Reason* that a Man most needs:  
 'Tis what he may have stored of his good *Deeds*.  
*Corruption* is opposed to what is Best;  
 a serious thing is often caused by *Jest*.  
 Believing *Slander* leads one to Perdition;  
 Who tells you Ill, your Ill is his Ambition.  
 Here are three baneful things: *Youth, Riches, Leisure*,  
 that have corrupted People without Measure.<sup>22</sup>

When we hear platitudes like "Corruption is opposed to what is best" we would almost be tempted to read the poem as a parody. Instead of calling it didactic I should prefer to call this genre gnomic or paraenetic; it is extremely common in classical Arabic poetry, though usually in the form either of short poems or short passages in longer poems, and more coherent than Abū l-ʿAtāhiya's jumbled aphorisms.

Abū l-ʿAtāhiya was deadly serious. In a later poet we find a mixture of the serious and the unserious. Ibn Makānis (d.1392), vizier and man of letters in fourteenth-century Egypt, wrote a poem on the etiquette of the *naḍīm* or 'boon companion'. It is interesting to see that Carl Brockelmann wrote in the first edition of his *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* that it contains "Vorschriften für die Lebensführung", but changed this in the supplementary volumes into "über die Eigenschaften seiner Zeitgenossen".<sup>23</sup> For what appears to be, at first sight, a didactic poem on good behaviour in polite, though somewhat dissipated, society, turns out to be a satirical description of the dissolute rich and the sycophantic and greedy not-quite-so-rich. A few lines:

|    |                                |                                 |
|----|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 25 | <i>Lā taṣḥabi l-khasīsā</i>    | <i>lā tuskhiṭi l-raʿīsā</i>     |
|    | <i>Lā tukthiri l-ʿitābā</i>    | <i>tunaffiri l-aṣḥābā</i>       |
|    | <i>Fa-kathratu l-muʿātabah</i> | <i>tadʿū ilā l-mujānabah</i>    |
|    | <i>Wa-in ḥalalta majlisā</i>   | <i>bayna surātin ruʿasā</i>     |
|    | <i>Iqṣid riḍā l-jamāʿah</i>    | <i>wa-kun ghulāma l-ṭāʿah</i>   |
| 30 | <i>Wa-dārihim bi-l-luṭfī</i>   | <i>wa-ḥdhar wabāla l-sukḥfī</i> |
|    | ...                            |                                 |
|    | <i>Lā taḥmili l-ṭaʿāmā</i>     | <i>wa-l-nuqla wa-l-mudāmā</i>   |
|    | <i>Fa-dhāka fī l-walīmah</i>   | <i>shanāʿatun ʿaẓīmah</i>       |

<sup>22</sup> al-Isfahānī, *al-Aghānī* (as in n.21) iv, 36.

<sup>23</sup> C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* (Leiden 1895-1900) ii, 15; *Supplementbände* (Leiden 1937-1942) ii, 7. I have used the text as it appears in al-ʿĀmilī, *al-Kashkūl* (Beirut 1983) 77-83 (164 *rajaz* couplets in paired rhyme); cf. al-Nawājī, *Ḥalbat al-kumayt* (Cairo 1938) 42-45, 337.

- |    |                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 40 | <i>Lā yartadīhi ādamiyy</i><br><i>Wa-qul mina l-kalāmī</i><br><i>Ka-rāʾiqi l-ashʿārī</i><br><i>Wa-truk kalāma l-safilah</i><br><i>Wa-qālātī l-akyāsū</i> | <i>ghayru muqillin ʿādimī</i><br><i>mā lāqa bi-l-mudāmī</i><br><i>wa-tayyibi l-akhhbārī</i><br><i>wa-l-nukata l-mubtadhalah</i><br><i>idhā urīqa kāsū</i><br><i>fī ghāyati l-taʿjilī</i> |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- 25 Do not befriend inferiors;  
 don't anger your superiors.  
 And do not always blame your friend,  
 lest he will loathe you in the end.  
 For an abundance of reproof  
 makes one be shunned and kept aloof.  
 When you receive an invitation  
 from leading persons in the nation,  
 Ev'ryone's favour you must crave,  
 And act as ev'rybody's slave.
- 30 With kind and civil words you'll flatter;  
 beware of odious, foolish chatter.

...

- Don't pilfer wine, or snacks, or food:  
 at parties that is very rude,
- 40 And not condoned by any gent  
 who isn't poor or indigent.  
 Speak only words that go with wine:  
 poems sublime and stories fine.  
 Shun words that come from lower folk,  
 or any trite and vulgar joke.  
 A shrewd advice: it comes to pass  
 that wine is spilt from upset glass:  
 Act promptly then, and in a jiff  
 be ready with your handkerchief.<sup>24</sup>

After this example of light verse that may be called didactic in a secondary sense, a few more serious types to conclude with. There are some religious poems that could be called didactic while sometimes being of considerable literary merit. The famous ode on the Prophet Mohammed by al-Būṣīrī (d.c.1296) packs into its 160 lines much of what the average medieval Muslim knew or ought to know of Mohammed's life; those who wanted more detail could try and memorise the 25,000 lines of the versified Life of the Prophet by Ibn al-Shahīd.<sup>25</sup> Of a much higher poetic quality are some mystical

<sup>24</sup> al-ʿĀmilī, *al-Kashkūl*, 78-79.

<sup>25</sup> On al-Būṣīrī, see R. Basset, "Burda", in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (as in n.7). On Ibn al-Shahīd see A.J. Arberry, "The Sira in verse", in: G. Makdisi (ed.), *Arabic and Islamic studies in honor of Hamilton A.R. Gibb* (Leiden 1965) 64-72.

poems, such as the short allegorical poem by the philosopher Avicenna on the soul, compared to a bird,<sup>26</sup> or the long ode (761 lines) by the Egyptian mystic poet Ibn al-Fāriḍ (d.1235), entitled “The Poem of the [Mystic] Way”;<sup>27</sup> a poem that is meant to instruct disciples on the mystic Path.<sup>27</sup> If Ṣafā’ al-Khulūṣī, the author of the aforementioned survey of didactic verse, had wanted to mention some high-quality didactic poems, he might have mentioned these and similar authors with some justification. Yet I believe that the styles of these poems and the true ‘unpoetic’ didactic poems are sufficiently dissimilar to allow one to consider them distinct genres. One only has to compare, for instance, Avicenna’s poem on the soul with his medical *urjūza*<sup>28</sup> to realise that only the latter may truly be called didactic; here is beginning of the former, in which the soul is described as descending into the body:

*Habaṭat ilayka mina l-maḥalli l-arfaʿi  
warqāʿu dhātu taʿazzuzin wa-tamannuʿi  
Maḥjūbatun min kulli muqlati ʿarīfin  
wa-hya llati safarat fa-lam tatabarqaʿi  
Waṣalat ʿalā kurhin ilayka wa-rubbamā  
karihat firāqaka wa-hya dhātu tafajjuʿi  
Anīfat wa-mā alīfat fa-lammā wāṣalat  
alīfat mujāwarata l-kharābi l-balqaʿi*

There descended to you, from the highest place,  
a grey dove, proud and disdaining,  
veiled from the eye of every knower,  
though herself not wearing any veil.  
She reached you with reluctance, yet  
she may well loathe to depart from you in her distress.  
Scorning, not friendly and tame; but once having arrived  
she gets used to living near a ruin, a wasteland.

And here, by way of contrast, are a few lines from his medical poem, which he has “clothed with the robe of perfection and the state of beauty”, as he says in his prose introduction, but which is purely didactic and not poetic in the least:

<sup>26</sup> In Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, *ʿUyūn al-anbāʾ*, ed. A. Müller (Cairo-Königsberg 1882-1884) ii, 10-11; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-aʿyān*, ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās (Beirut 1968-1972) ii, 160-161, ed. and transl. by B. Carra de Vaux, *Journal Asiatique*, série 9, tome 14 (1899) 157-173.

<sup>27</sup> Ibn al-Fāriḍ, *The Poem of the Way*, transl. A.J. Arberry (Dublin 1956).

<sup>28</sup> Avicenna, *Poème de la médecine*, texte arabe, traduction française, traduction latine du XIIIe siècle avec introd., notes et index par Henri Jahier & Abdelkader Nouredine (Paris 1956) 10.

- 686 *Karāhatu l-ḍawʿi wa-damʿun jāri*  
*bi-shiddati l-taḥrīki wa-zwirārī*  
*Wa-ṣigharun fī l-ʿayni farda jānibī*  
*wa-l-famu maftūḥun bilā tathāʿubī*  
*Wa-l-marʿu yastalqī ʿalā qafāhū*  
*qadi rtakhat yadāhu aw riḷāhū*  
*Wa-in badā yanzilu ʿan marqadihī*  
*wa-kāshifan ʿan riḷihī wa-yadihī*
- 690 *Wa-in tashakkala bi-shaklin munkarī*  
*wa-qad badā yuʿnā bi-naṭfi l-zīʿbarī*  
*Aw thaqulat aṭrāfuhū fī l-muntahā*  
*wa-qad badā muʿtaliḡan bimā yarā*  
*Wa-ṣarratu l-asnāni dūna ʿādah*  
*wa-walaʿu l-yadayni bi-l-wisādah*  
*Wa-in takhayyala ghulāman aswadā*  
*yurīdu an yaqtulahū idhā badā*  
*Wa-in yakun fī maraḡin dhī ḥiddah*  
*fa-mawtuhū minhu qarību l-muddah*

[On movements indicative of impending death]

Aversion to light; flowing tears with violent movement and swerving [of the eye],

Diminution of only one eye, an open mouth without yawning;  
 When he lies on his back with relaxed arms and legs;  
 When he is seen leaving his bed, baring feet and hands;

- 690 When he takes on a horrible appearance and when he is seen busy plucking the nap of the bedcover;

Or when the extremities are heavy and his stare is fixed on what he sees;

An unusual gnashing of the teeth; fiddling with the pillow with his hands;

When he imagines seeing a black youth who wants to kill him,  
 In the course of a severe illness, then his death is nigh.<sup>29</sup>

The differences are obvious: although both poems are able to evoke vivid images, only the medical poem, with its clumsy syntax and repetitive diction, is properly called didactic, since it provides clear and exact information without metaphors and other imagery. In the poem on the soul and other poems Avicenna showed that he was capable of making 'true' poetry of some quality; the medical poem is doggerel by choice, not through incompetence.

More than twenty years ago now, Wolfhart Heinrichs briefly discussed the place of didactic poetry in Arabic literature:

<sup>29</sup> Avicenna, *Poème* (as in n.28) 56-57.

...in many cases it is impossible to keep “genuine” and didactic poetry apart. Still, a versified grammar cannot be considered poetry. But the criteria that would allow an unambiguous distinction between the two have yet to be formulated.<sup>30</sup>

This paper has been little more than an extended comment on what was quoted from Khulūṣī's chapter and this quotation from Heinrichs. I am unable to give a fully satisfying formulation of “the criteria that would allow an unambiguous distinction” between true poetry and didactic poetry, simply because poetry may be poetic and didactic at the same time. It may be helpful to distinguish between two different senses of the phrase ‘didactic poetry’, a difference not unlike that between ‘black bird’ and ‘blackbird’, although here both spelling and intonation distinguish the two. In a general sense, ‘didactic poetry’ means of course ‘any poetry that is didactic’; but as a particular genre in Arabic literature it may be narrowed by the following definition: any text that is poetry in terms of its prosody (i.e. metre and rhyme) in which the typical poetic style (tropes, figures of speech, etc.) is deliberately avoided, for the sake of providing explicit information on a particular branch of knowledge. In short, ‘true’ didactic poetry is didactic rather than poetry, whereas didactic poetry that is ‘true’ poetry is poetic rather than didactic. In its narrow sense, therefore, ‘didactic poetry’ is a misnomer; it ought to be replaced by something like ‘versified teaching’ or ‘versified knowledge’. Unfortunately, the term ‘didactic poetry’ is too well-established to be replaced. It is useful, at least, to be aware of its two different senses. Ṣafā' Khulūṣī has had to bear the brunt of the present attack; it is only fair to say that many western critics writing on western literature show much of the same confusion when they discuss ‘didactic literature’, although they usually express themselves more carefully than Khulūṣī. Most authors of reference works on literary terms containing an entry for ‘didactic poetry’ are preoccupied with the great ‘literary’ poets: Lucretius, Virgil, Dante, Milton, Pope and the rest. In works focusing on literature this is no doubt justified; but it is a one-sided picture of the genre of didactic poetry.

---

<sup>30</sup> W. Heinrichs, “Literary Theory: The Problem of Its Efficiency”, in: G.E. von Grunebaum (ed.), *Arabic poetry: theory and development*, Third Giorgio Levi Della Vida Biennial Conference (Wiesbaden 1973) 19-69, 27.





## THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE SCIENCES AND THE CONSOLIDATION OF PHILOLOGY IN CLASSICAL ISLAM

WOLFHART HEINRICHS

As is well known, the term *adab* (lit. “good behaviour”, “good custom”) has a large variety of acceptations and is ill-defined in most of them. This makes it difficult to speak about it in general terms and, consequently, it is not rare to find disagreements and obscurities in the secondary literature due to different conceptions and definitions. The semantic history of the term was first traced in the classic study by Carlo-Alfonso Nallino.<sup>1</sup> Although he does not always provide references to corroborate his story, his intuitive vision of the semantic development, or rather developments in the plural, appears very convincing. It is interesting to note that the diagram, which he provides in order to show the genealogy of the various meanings of *adab*, does not quite tally with the text itself—a sign that Nallino was still grappling with the details of the semantic processes. Nallino’s results were summarised without much modification by Francesco Gabrieli in the entry “Adab” in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.<sup>2</sup> The early history of the term was recently reviewed by Seeger A. Bonebakker, who questioned, and corrected, some of Nallino’s findings.<sup>3</sup> For the present purpose it is not necessary to enter into this discussion again; suffice it to say that, when Islamic culture reached maturity in the fourth/tenth century, *adab* had three

---

<sup>1</sup> In the “Introduction” to his *La Littérature arabe des origines à l’époque de la dynastie umayyade. Leçons professées en arabe à l’Université du Caire*; traduction française par Charles Pellat d’après la version italienne de Maria Nallino (Paris 1950) 7-28. The original lectures were given in 1910-11 and never published (?). The Italian version done by Nallino’s daughter was published in: C.A. Nallino, *Raccolta di scritti editi ed inediti*, vol.6 (Rome 1948).

<sup>2</sup> “Adab”, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden 1960— ) vol.1, 175-176.

<sup>3</sup> S.A. Bonebakker, “Early Arabic Literature and the Term Adab”, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 5 (1984) 389-421. On p.389 n.1, the article is identified as the pre-publication of a contribution written in 1975 for the *Cambridge History of Arabic Literature*. However, in its ‘republished’ form as chapter 1 (“Adab and the Concept of Belles-Lettres”), in: J. Ashtiany et al. (eds.), *‘Abbasid Belles-Lettres* (Cambridge 1990) 16-30, it appears to be heavily edited.

major acceptations<sup>4</sup> that were categorically different from each other: 1) “good, correct, polite behaviour”, 2) “a genre of anecdotal and anthological literature which serves as a quarry of quotable materials (*muḥāḍarāt*) for the bel-esprit”, and 3) “a body of knowledge in the linguistic and literary field which comprises the genre of literature just mentioned, but includes further ancillary disciplines like grammar etc.”

The question addressed in this paper is whether *adab* during the acme of Abbasid culture embodied a separate and distinctive ideal of education and intellectual pursuit, parallel to, for example, that of the *faqīh*, the *ḥakīm*, and the *faqīr*. We are thus dealing, first and foremost, with the third meaning of the term—one which might be rendered with the less ambiguous expression *al-‘ulūm al-adabiyya*. If we can find an answer to our question, that would be helpful indeed in characterising the physiognomy of classical Islamic culture. Underlying this is, of course, a less far-reaching and more modest question: Are the *‘ulūm adabiyya* an independent and internally coherent system of disciplines and where do they have their place in relation to the other groups of *‘ulūm*? One way to approach this question is to take a closer look at the literature devoted to the division of the sciences. This literature, characteristically, began to flourish in the fourth/tenth century, in what Adam Mez and, following him, Joel Kraemer have called the “renaissance” of Islam. This was a time when most Islamic sciences and disciplines were engaged in a conscious reflection upon their past in order to find their internal norm and their place in the overall system of meaning. Typical manifestations of this trend are the writing of handbooks, the formulation of *uṣūl*, i.e., methodological meta-discourses for various disciplines (above all *fiqh* and *naḥw*), and the interest in the division of sciences. This latter endeavour was certainly brought about under the influence of the Greek philosophical heritage, and in more than one sense: 1) the classical divisions of philosophy, usually on the basis of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*, served as a model, and already al-Kindī produced a work of this kind;<sup>5</sup> 2) the reception of a number of new

<sup>4</sup> And several minor ones, among them even “mathematics”.

<sup>5</sup> Ch. Hein, *Definition und Einteilung der Philosophie. Von der spätantiken Einleitungsliteratur zur arabischen Enzyklopädie* (Bern 1985); A. Cortabarría Beitia, “La Classification des sciences chez al-Kindī”, *Mélanges de l’institut dominicain d’études orientales* 11 (1972) 49-76.

sciences required a fair amount of sorting out, especially as far as their relationship with indigenous disciplines was concerned.

The tenth-century works dealing exclusively or partially with the divisions of the sciences are the following: al-Fārābī (d.339/950): *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿulūm* ("The Enumeration of the Sciences"), the *Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ* ("Epistles of the 'Sincere Brethren'", *terminus ad quem* for their composition: 347-48/959-60<sup>6</sup>), al-Khuwārizmī (wrote between 366/976 and 372/982): *Mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm* ("The Keys of the Sciences"), Ibn Farīghūn:<sup>7</sup> *Jawāmiʿ al-ʿulūm* ("The Summaries of the Sciences"), Ibn al-Nadīm (d.380/990): *al-Fihrist* ("The Catalogue"), al-ʿĀmirī (d.381/992): *al-ʿIlām bi-manāqib al-Islām* ("Proclamation of the Virtues of Islam"), and Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī (d.414/1023): *Risāla fī l-ʿulūm* ("Epistle on the Sciences"). Before we take a closer look at them, it should be mentioned that, according to Nallino, the broad meaning of *adab* which we are interested in here did not arise before the end of the fifth/eleventh century.<sup>8</sup> This tallies well with the earliest attestation of the term *al-ʿulūm al-adabiyya* known to me; it is found in a work on prosody written by the grammarian, lexicographer, prosodist, Koranic commentator, collector of proverbs and *littérateur* al-Zamakhsharī (d.538/1144) who also draws up a list of these *ʿulūm*.<sup>9</sup>

The first question then is whether the earlier, tenth-century, texts already have a similar notion of a unified field of *adab* disciplines or in some way lead up to it. These works are very heterogeneous in their underlying motivations and assumptions and need to be taken

<sup>6</sup> According to S. Diwald, *Arabische Philosophie und Wissenschaft in der Enzyklopädie Kitāb Iḥwān al-ṣafāʾ* (iii): *Die Lehre von Seele und Intellekt* (Wiesbaden 1975) 15-16. There is, however, no unanimity among scholars concerning the date of the work nor the identity and affiliation of its author(s). Diwald has pointed out that, according to the best evidence, the title of the work is *Kitāb Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ*, "The Book of the Sincere Brethren", a title which evokes less easily than does "The Epistles" the idea of a plurality of authors.

<sup>7</sup> Dates unknown. He was a disciple of Abū Zayd al-Balkhī (d.322/934).

<sup>8</sup> Nallino, *Littérature arabe* (as in n.1) 25. The evidence he adduces is the title of the biographical lexicon *Nuzhat al-alibbāʾ fī ṭabaqāt al-udabāʾ* ("The Entertainment of Intelligent Men: On the Classes of Those Who Profess Adab") by Abū l-Barakāt Ibn al-Anbārī (d.577/1181), where "those who profess *adab*" is meant to cover grammarians and lexicographers.

<sup>9</sup> *al-Qusṭās al-mustaqīm fī ʿilm al-ʿarūd* ("The Level Balance: On the Science of Prosody"), ed. Bahija Bāqir al-Ḥasanī (Baghdad 1969) 53. Cf. also W. Heinrichs (ed.), *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, Bd.5: *Orientalisches Mittelalter* (Wiesbaden 1990) 26. The list will be commented upon below.

up one by one. Nonetheless, the following generalisations may be made: three of the authors are philosophers, namely al-Fārābī, al-ʿĀmirī, and Ibn Farīghūn, and three are *kuttāb* with a philosophical interest, namely Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Khuwārizmī, and Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī. (How the *Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ* should be defined is a matter of much debate. If we follow Netton, they belong in the philosophical camp.<sup>10</sup>) We can also divide the texts into groups according to their subject-matter: al-Fārābī's *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿulūm*, Ibn Farīghūn's *Jawāmiʿ al-ʿulūm*, and al-Tawḥīdī's *Risāla fī l-ʿulūm* are strict classifications, although very different from each other in character; Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist* is, of course, a catalogue of the existing Arabic literature, whether original or in translation, arranged according to fields for practical reasons; al-Khuwārizmī's *Mafātīḥ al-ʿulūm* is a topically arranged dictionary of technical terms; al-ʿĀmirī's *Iʿlām* is a defence of Islam on the basis of a well-conceived epistemology and classification of knowledge; and the *Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ* an encyclopaedia of soul-saving religious-philosophical knowledge (gnosis).

### 1. AL-FĀRĀBĪ

Starting with al-Fārābī, his *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿulūm*<sup>11</sup> is a logically progressing curriculum of sciences where each separate group of disciplines presupposes the preceding one (except, of course, the first). It may also be seen as a somewhat systematised history of the sciences within any given *umma*. The indigenous and the Greek sciences are fully integrated; in fact, it would not even make sense for al-Fārābī to introduce this distinction, since, ideally, the logical procession of the sciences can and will happen in any self-contained nation.<sup>12</sup> The first chapter is devoted to linguistic and literary matters. It is called *ʿilm al-lisān*, “the science of the language”, which is not a

<sup>10</sup> I.R. Netton, *Muslim Neoplatonists. An Introduction to the Thought of the Brethren of Purity* (London 1982).

<sup>11</sup> al-Fārābī, *Iḥṣāʾ al-ʿulūm*, ed. A. Gonzalez Palencia, *Catálogo de las ciencias* (Madrid/Granada 1953, 2nd ed.).

<sup>12</sup> For a detailed analysis of this work, see Muhsin Mahdi, “Science, Philosophy, and Religion in Alfarabi's Enumeration of the Sciences”, in: J.E. Murdoch, E.D. Sylla (eds.), *The Cultural Context of Medieval Learning. Proceedings of the First International Colloquium on Philosophy, Science, and Theology in the Middle Ages—September 1973* (Dordrecht 1975) 113-147.

traditional term and probably al-Fārābī's own coinage. Its division is as follows:<sup>13</sup>

1. *ḥifẓ al-alfāẓ* (*conseruatio dictionum*), "memorisation of the utterances"
  - a. *ʿilm al-alfāẓ al-mufrada* (*scientia dictionum simplicium*), "knowledge ['science' would not be appropriate here] of single utterances [i.e., words]", i.e. lexicography, incl. word explanation, memorisation and transmission, loan words, rare words, commonly accepted words.
  - b. *ʿilm al-alfāẓ al-murakkaba* (*scientia dictionum compositarum*), "knowledge of utterances when put together", i.e., transmission of literature, "what their orators and poets have produced and what their eloquent and language-masters (*bulaghāʾ*, *fuṣaḥāʾ*) have enunciated".
2. *ʿilm qawānīn al-alfāẓ*, "science of the rules governing the utterances"
  - c. *ʿilm qawānīn al-alfāẓ ʿindamā takūn mufrada* (*scientia canonum dictionum quoniam sunt simplices*) "science of the rules pertaining to single utterances"
    - a) phonetics, b) word formation, c) morphology
  - d. *ʿilm qawānīn al-alfāẓ ʿindamā tarakkab* (*scientia canonum dictionum quoniam componuntur*) "science of the rules governing the utterances when they are put together"
    - a) rules of grammar, b) rules of composition (incl. what is more eloquent)
  - e. *ʿilm qawānīn taṣḥīḥ al-kitāba* ([*scientia*] *canonum uerificationis scripture*), "science of the rules of orthography"
  - f. *ʿilm qawānīn taṣḥīḥ al-qirāʾa* ([*scientia*] *canonum uerificationis lectionis*), "science of the rules of correct reading" [refers to the various diacritical signs]
  - g. *ʿilm qawānīn al-ashʿār* ([*scientia*] *canonum uersuum*), "science of the rules pertaining to poems," *ʿalā l-jiha allatī tushākil ʿilm al-lisān* (*sive modum qui convenit scientie lingue*), "inasmuch as they

<sup>13</sup> *Iḥṣāʾ* 9-21, in particular 12,7-11. The Latin equivalences are from Gerhard of Cremona's translation; *Iḥṣāʾ* 121-127.

correspond to the science of language” [i.e., not the logical treatment of poetry]

- α. *iḥṣāʾ al-awzān al-mustaʿmala fī ashʿārihim* (. . . *pondera usitata in uersibus eorum*), “enumeration of the metres used in their poems”
- β. *al-naẓar fī nihāyāt al-abyāt* (*aspectus in finibus uersuum*), “investigation of the ends of lines” [rhyme theory]
- γ. [*al-faḥṣ*] *ʿammā yaṣluḥ an yastaʿmilahū l-shuʿarāʾ min al-alfāẓ ʿindahum mimḡā laysa yaṣluḥ an yustaʿmal fī l-qawl alladhī laysa bi-shiʿr* (*inquirīt de eo quod est conveniens ut utatur in uersibus ex dictionibus apud eos de illis quibus nod [sic] est conveniens uti in orationem [sic] que non est versus*) “identification of words that, according to them, can be used by poets, but not in non-poetic speech”.

In his descriptions of the various subfields of the “science of the language” al-Fārābī is quite clearly talking about the Arabic language—and, we might add, quite expertly, although in certain cases he uses the philosophical rather than the indigenous grammatical terminology (such as *kalīm*, calqued after Greek ῥήματα, rather than *aḡʿāl* for “verbs”). However, he is also quite explicit that this initial science, depending on the *umma* “nation” in which it developed, might be dealing with a different language. The same is true *mutatis mutandis* for the last two sciences mentioned in this work, “jurisprudence” (*ṣināʿat al-fiqh* = *ars legis*<sup>14</sup>) and “apologetic theology” (*ṣināʿat al-kalām* = *ars elocutionis*). Both presuppose the appearance of a religious legislator (*wāḍiʿ al-shariʿa* = *legis positor*<sup>15</sup>) who brings a divine law that becomes the basis of a new community, and both arise only after the death of the legislator, when—in the case of jurisprudence—new legal determinations need to be made on the basis of the law brought by the legislator or when—in the case of theology—the existing law needs to be defended and justified. Again, although al-Fārābī has the Islamic situation in mind, his description of the two religious sciences is meant to apply to all

<sup>14</sup> Thus in the text itself, p.99,9 (Arabic), 171, ult. (Latin), whereas the chapter title has *ʿilm al-fiqh* = *scientia legis*; cf. 91, l.10 (Arabic), 167, l.2 (Latin). The same is true for *kalām*; cf. 100, l.6 (Arabic), 172, l.13 (Latin) and the chapter title just quoted. *Elocutio* is, of course, a literal translation of *kalām* which is oblivious of its real meaning.

<sup>15</sup> First occurrence 99, l.10 (Arabic), 172, l.1 (Latin).

revealed religions. Characteristically, the focus shifts from the *umma*, “nation”, prevalent in the first chapter, to the *milla*, “religion, religious community” in the present context; this, however, does not mean that the *umma* has now turned into a *milla*: al-Fārābī explicitly says that a *milla* is created *within* an *umma*.<sup>16</sup> Naturally, he was aware of the variety of *millas* within the Arab *umma*.

In any case, the “science of the language” treated at the beginning of the *Enumeration* and the two religious sciences that bring up the rear differ from the intervening sciences by not being universal and thus truly philosophical. This is, however, not the whole truth. By speaking in the abstract about any language and any revealed religion that might individually occur he reaches a high degree of universality even in these parts of his work. Šāʿid al-Andalusī (d.462/1070) is certainly right, when he (in Blachère’s trsl.) says about al-Fārābī’s *Enumeration*: “Aucun ouvrage de ce genre n’existait auparavant, nul n’avait suivi la méthode qui y est adoptée; nulle personne se livrant à l’étude, ne peut s’abstenir de s’y référer ou de le lire au préalable”.<sup>17</sup> But this singularity renders the book less suitable for our purposes: it is a monument of the superior mind of its author, but only minimally a reflection of existing tendencies of the classification of knowledge in the society at large. Moreover, if we take the intentions of the author seriously, then what he is presenting in the first chapter is *not* the science of Arabic language and literature. On the other hand, the Arabic situation is what he had in mind, when he made his general statements. A few observations on this text are therefore in order.

Of the seven parts of *ʿilm al-lisān* only the first four are centrally involved with language, since the fifth and sixth deal with the writing system and the seventh with technical aspects of poetry.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Cf. 99, ll.12-13: . . . ʿalā ḥasabi gharaḍi wāḍiʿi l-sharʿati bi-l-millati llatī sharraʿahā fī l-ummati llatī lahā shurriʿa, which in the Latin version, 172, ll.4-5, reads: . . . *secundum intentionem positoris cum secta quam posuit in gente cui statuta est*.

<sup>17</sup> Trsl. by R. Blachère, Šāʿid al-Andalusī. *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt Al-Umam* (*Livre des Catégories des Nations*) (Paris 1935) 108.

<sup>18</sup> The third part of the “science of the rules of poems” presents a difficulty. It is undeniable that Arabic poetry, like most other poetries of the world, contains “poetic” words that are not normally encountered in prose. They include, e.g., epithets used metonymically like *ṣārim*, “cutter”, for “sword”, expressive Bedouin words like *khanshalīl* for *qawīy*, “strong”, or even constructions like *wāw rubba*. There is, however, no special branch of poetics or lexicography dealing with this aspect, the reason being—but this is only an assumption—that the classical Arabic



The first four are structured by two dichotomies: “memorisation” versus “knowledge of rules”, and “simple” versus “composite” utterances. The first corresponds to what is otherwise expressed in the rhymed pairs *naql-ʿaql*, “tradition”-“reason”, or *riwāya-dirāya*, “transmission”-“cognition”. The second dichotomy is equivalent to “word” versus “sentence”, but the use of “simple” and “composite” points to a philosophical basis in al-Fārābī’s mind along the lines of *ḥadd* versus *qaḍīya*, “definition” versus “judgement”, or *taṣawwur* versus *taṣdīq*, “concept” versus “assent”. The overall result is a very neat classification. Is it congruent with the existing linguistic disciplines? While one can easily recognise that parts one, three and four approximately correspond to the traditional fields of *luḡha*, “lexicography”, *ṣarf* “morphology” (in a rather broad sense), and *naḥw*, “syntax”, part two, the transmission of literature, is certainly a favourite activity of many Arab philologists, but not a well defined field with a name. It would probably simply be called *riwāya* “transmission”, if necessary with a specifying genitive. This raises the question whether al-Fārābī was thinking only of ancient literature; it seems likely that he was. Another weakness is that part four does double duty for syntax and style. This also means that part two and four do not precisely mirror each other. The reason is clear: while one can transmit all words of a language, one cannot transmit all sentences, but only those that have become notable for their quality (part two); however, where rules are concerned, one wants to have those that generate correct sentences just as much as those that generate good/beautiful sentences (part four). Finally, as mentioned above, the designation *ʿilm al-lisān*, “science of the language”, is probably al-Fārābī’s own coinage. Strangely, however, there is no traditional equivalent for this term; there certainly were some scholars of broad interest who cultivated all of the various subfields listed, but there was as yet no comprehensive name. Such a name did arise about 150-200 years later, and it was precisely the term *adab*, in the sense of *ʿulūm adabiyya*. We may thus take al-Fārābī’s classification as proof for the logic of this historical development.

---

language started out as an intertribal poetic koine, so that the idea of poetic language as a *special* register did not arise. There is, however, also the phenomenon of poetic licence, in Arabic *ḡarūrat al-shiʿr*, “the constraint of poetry”, under which rubric are included truncated word forms and other deviations from the norm. And there were, indeed, books devoted to this topic (Ibn Fāris, al-Qazzāz, et al.). It is, therefore, possible that al-Fārābī is thinking of this particular aspect of poetry.

2. *IKHWĀN AL-ṢAFĀʾ*

The *Rasāʾil* of the Sincere Brethren are a much more massive book than al-Fārābī's *Enumeration*, a veritable encyclopaedia and confluence of all sciences and of all religious and philosophical discourses that had emerged or become known in the first few Islamic centuries. Its purpose is, however, not to create a work of reference or to give a picture of the intellectual and religious life. Much more momentous issues are at stake. Underlying the whole enterprise is the gnostic idea of (self-)knowledge and subsequent self-purification as the only way to salvation. The necessary gnosis is all-encompassing, holistic, and indivisible; so all known scientific data and hypotheses, all suitable "theologemes" and "philosophemes" were woven into the grand carpet. As a result, this is the first great attempt at an Islamic religious synthesis of existing *Weltanschauungen*, and it has had an enormous influence on later Islamic (and also Jewish) intellectual history. This process, the details of which are not at all well known, is all the more astonishing, since the *Rasāʾil*, with their "mixing" of philosophy and religion and their Shīʿite hue, are far from being mainstream, and many of the great names who profess to have read them (e.g. Ibn Sīnā, al-Ghazālī, Ibn Taymiyya, all with different agendas) do not fail to castigate them severely.

When it comes to the question that we are interested in here, the yield is admittedly rather disappointing. In the seventh epistle, the author(s) propose(s) a threefold division of the sciences into the "propaedeutic" (*al-riyādiyya*), the "religious" (*al-sharʿiyya al-waḍʿiyya*), and the "philosophical" (*al-falsafīyya al-ḥaqīqīyya*)<sup>19</sup>. The "propaedeutic sciences" (or, less pretentiously, "bodies of knowledge") are characterised at the beginning as "the knowledge of certain principles of behaviour (*ādāb*) which have mostly been instituted for the sake of making a living and keeping your life in order". Nine are listed, and they are a rather non-homogeneous bunch, basically in three major areas of expertise: a) business and economics, b) occult practices (scil. omens, talismans, etc.) and c) several that may be

<sup>19</sup> *Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ wa-khullān al-wafāʾ* (Beirut n.d.) i, 266-275. Cf. Seyyed Hossein Nasr, *An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines* (Cambridge Mass. 1964) 40-43. It should be noted that the religious and the philosophical sciences are here expressed by hendiadys expressions, which should be translated as "instituted religious" and "essential philosophical". For translating *riyādiyya* as "propaedeutic", see Ch. Hein, *Definition und Einteilung* (as in n.7) 178-181.

labelled *‘ulūm adabiyya*, such as *‘ilm al-kitāba wa-l-qirā’a*, “the knowledge of writing and reading”, *‘ilm al-luġha wa-l-naĥw*, “the knowledge of lexicography and grammar”, *‘ilm al-shi‘r wa-l-‘arūd*, “the knowledge of poetry and prosody”, and *‘ilm al-siyar wa-l-akĥbār*, “the knowledge of historical reports”. But they are not all contiguous in the enumeration, and thus do not form a unit of any kind. Moreover, the enumeration is just that; there are no further explanations and justifications of any kind. Apart from this specific division of the sciences, the overall layout of the *Rasā’il* is, of course, another attempt to list all fields of human knowledge and one that diverges considerably from their own classification. Unfortunately, the linguistic and literary disciplines fare even worse here by being passed over in silence.<sup>20</sup> This state of affairs is somewhat surprising, inasmuch as the author(s) are clearly very interested in the practical side of literary things: their work is studded with fictional (mostly, but not always allegorical) stories to drive home certain points, and these can be very elaborate and extensive.<sup>21</sup>

### 3. AL-KHUWĀRIZMĪ

Al-Khuwārizmī’s *Mafātīḥ al-‘ulūm* is a topically arranged dictionary (with some narrative) of technical terms in the various sciences, compiled for the benefit of the state scribes (*kuttāb*).<sup>22</sup> He is the first among our authors to use the dichotomy between indigenous and foreign sciences, or as he calls them: *‘ulūm al-sharī’a wa-mā yaqtarin bihā min al-‘ulūm al-‘arabiyya*, “the sciences of the Divine Law and the Arabic sciences connected with them”, and *‘ulūm al-‘ajam min*

<sup>20</sup> The 17th *risāla* in the second part (*Rasā’il*, iii, 84-177), entitled “On the diversity of languages, the styles of writing systems and expressions” does contain a fair amount of linguistic topics, but mainly in general terms, not specifically Arabic.

<sup>21</sup> The most famous being *The Case of the Animals versus Man Before the King of the Jinn*, trsl. L.E. Goodman (Boston 1978); more recent German trsl. by A. Giese, *Mensch und Tier vor dem König der Dschinnen* (Hamburg 1990). This is not an allegorical story, because the animals represent themselves, not any abstract notions, nor can it be called a fable, since they are not used to demonstrate human behaviour. This is not to deny that the story contains allegorical and fable elements. But the question of the literary genre to which it belongs is still moot.

<sup>22</sup> For a general characteristic, see C.E. Bosworth, “A Pioneer Arabic Encyclopedia of the Sciences: al Khwārizmī’s Keys of the Sciences”, *Isis* 54 (1963) 97-111.

*al-Yūnāniyyīn wa-ghayrihim min al-umam*, “the sciences of the non-Arabs, i.e. Greeks and other nations”.<sup>23</sup> The *sharʿiyya-falsafiyya* dichotomy of the Sincere Brethren is, of course, similar, but they do not dwell on the question of origin (Arab, non-Arab), nor would it make sense for them. In any case, al-Khuwārizmī’s two kinds of sciences make his material fall into two chapters (*maqāla*), but apart from this, there is no justification given for the arrangement of the material. Nonetheless, the last four chapters of the first *maqāla*, i.e., grammar (*naḥw*), scribal art (*kitāba*), poetry and prosody (*shiʿr wa-ʿarūd*), and history (*akhbār*), belong together and cover a good part of the *ʿulūm adabiyya*. It should be noted, though, that the author explicitly states a close connection between religious and linguistic sciences. It was, and remained, a commonplace notion that the study of the ancient language and poetry was indispensable for a correct understanding of Scripture. It is all the more surprising that al-Khuwārizmī did not include in his first *maqāla* the religious field that more than any other establishes the interface between religious and linguistic studies: Koranic exegesis. One explanation may be that the traditionist approach to exegesis, i.e., collection of reports about what early authorities, including the Prophet, had said about the meaning of a certain verse, did not yield a sufficient amount of technical terms to be included, while the linguistic and literary approaches (of the *maʿānī al-Qurʾān* type and possibly the hermeneutical sections in works on legal methodology) were thought to have been covered in the appropriate chapters.

#### 4. IBN FARĪGHŪN

Ibn Farīghūn was a philosopher of the al-Kindī “school”. His teacher was Abū Zayd al-Balkhī, who among other works wrote a division of the sciences which has not been preserved. His pupil may have inherited this interest. His book, the *Jawāmiʿ al-ʿulūm*, has only recently become generally accessible in a facsimile edition of the ms Istanbul, Ahmet III 2768.<sup>24</sup> Its overall layout is still obscure. There

<sup>23</sup> al-Khuwārizmī, *K. Maḥāṭib al-ʿulūm*, ed. G. van Vloten, *Liber Maḥāṭib al-olūm* (Leiden 1895, repr. 1968) 5-6.

<sup>24</sup> Ibn Farīghūn [Ibn Farīʿūn], *K. Jawāmiʿ al-ʿulūm. Compendium of Sciences*, facs. ed. Fuat Sezgin (Frankfurt 1985). Unfortunately, this facsimile edition has no table of contents.

is no introduction in which the author would have justified his arrangement; moreover, the book is presented in *mushajjar* (“family-tree”) form, which makes reading it cumbersome. Clear chapter headings are missing for the most part. There are two *maqālas*, the first deals *inter alia* with a) language, b) scribal art (incl. arithmetic and geometry), c) religion; the second deals with a) government, b) ethics, c) religion (again), d) epistemology and philosophy (plus occult sciences). There is some discussion on literary matters at the beginning of the epistemological section.<sup>25</sup> But it does not yield sufficient evidence on the position of the sciences dealing with literature within the larger classification.

#### 5. IBN AL-NADĪM

Ibn al-Nadīm’s “Catalogue” is a topically arranged list of all books existing in the Arabic language, whether they are original or translated.<sup>26</sup> It is noteworthy that, although the author does not give any justifications for arranging his material the way he does, certain groups of disciplines are readily recognisable. Thus, after his introductory chapter dealing with languages and scripts and with revealed books and, in particular, the Qurʾān, he has three chapters on what we may call the *ʿulūm adabiyya*, one on grammar and lexicography, one on history (*akhbār*), and one on poetry and poetry-related disciplines. (This is followed by two chapters on religious fields, one on philosophy and the sciences, and three on “nonsense”, i.e. fairy-tales and magic, foreign, non-Abrahamic, religions, and alchemy.) Given the fact that the division of the various fields of intellectual pursuit has been adopted for the eminently practical purpose of compiling a catalogue, the clustering seems significant.

#### 6. AL-ʿĀMIRĪ

Abū l-Ḥasan al-ʿĀmirī is another disciple of Abū Zayd al-Balkhī. In his *Proclamation of the Virtues of Islam* he accepts a dichotomy similar

<sup>25</sup> *Jawāmiʿ*, 134.

<sup>26</sup> Ibn al-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, ed. G. Flügel (Halle 1871-1872; repr. Beirut 1964) vol. 1, 2-4. For a general characterisation, see J. Fück, “Eine arabische Literaturgeschichte aus dem 10. Jahrhundert n. Chr.”, in: idem, *Arabische Kultur und Islam im Mittelalter. Ausgewählte Schriften*, ed. M. Fleischhammer (Weimar 1981) 17-26.

to that of the “Sincere Brethren” and al-Khuwārizmī, but rather than being satisfied with a mere enumeration of sciences, he constructs a well-balanced system together with an explicit justification.<sup>27</sup> His terms for the basic dichotomy are *al-ʿulūm al-millīyya* “the religious sciences” (or, more exactly, “the sciences peculiar to a specific religious community”) and *al-ʿulūm al-ḥikmiyya* “the philosophical sciences”. Their divisions are as follows:

1. *al-millī* (*arbābu l-ʿulūmi l-millīyyati humu l-muṣṭafawna min al-anbiyāʾ*) “that which is peculiar to a specific religious community (the masters of these sciences are the elect, i.e., the prophets)”.

*fa-ammā l-ʿulūmu l-millīyyatu fa-taftannu ilā ṣināʿatin thalāth* “as for these sciences, they branch out into three arts”:

a) *ḥissiyya* = *ṣināʿat al-muḥaddithīn*

“based on sense-perception = the art of the transmitters [of Prophetic Traditions]”

b) *ʿaqliyya* = *ṣināʿat al-mutakallimīn*

“based on intellect = the art of the theologians”

c) *mushtaraka bayn al-ḥiss wa-l-ʿaql* = *ṣināʿat al-fuqahāʾ*

“shared between sense-perception and intellect = the art of the jurists”

with: *ṣināʿat al-luḡa* = *ālā*

“the art of language = organon (for these three disciplines)”

2. *al-ḥikmī* (*arbābu l-ʿulūmi l-ḥikmiyyati humu l-murtaḍawna min al-ḥukamāʾ*) “that which is philosophical (the masters of these sciences are the select, i.e., the philosophers)”

a) *ḥissiyya* = *ṣināʿat al-ṭabīʿiyyīn*

“based on sense-perception = the art of the physicists”

b) *ʿaqliyya* = *ṣināʿat al-ilāhiyyīn*

“based on intellect = the art of the metaphysicians”

<sup>27</sup> Abū l-Ḥasan al-ʿĀmirī, *K. al-Fīlām bi-manāqib al-islām*, ed. Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Ghurāb (Cairo 1387/1967) 84. For a characterisation of al-ʿĀmirī, see the introduction to E.K. Rowson, *A Muslim Philosopher on the Soul and Its Fate: Al-ʿĀmirī’s Kitāb al-Amad ʿalā l-abad* (New Haven 1988) 3-29; for the *Fīlām* in particular see H.H. Biesterfeldt, “Abū l-Ḥasan al-ʿĀmirī und die Wissenschaften”, in: *ZDMG*, Suppl. iii, 1, W. Voigt (ed.), *XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 28. September bis 4. Oktober 1975 in Freiburg im Breisgau. Vorträge* (Wiesbaden 1977) 335-341.

c) *mushtaraka bayn al-ḥiss wa-l-ʿaql* = *ṣināʿat al-riyāḍiyyīn*

“shared between sense-perception and intellect = the art of the mathematicians”

α) *al-ʿadad* (“arithmetic”), β) *al-handasa* (“geometry”), γ) *al-tanjīm* (“astronomy, astrology”), δ) *al-taʿlīf* (“music”), ε) *al-ḥiyal* (“mechanics”).

with: *ṣināʿat al-manṭiq* = *ālā*

“the art of logic = organon (for these three disciplines)”

The use of the terms *millī* and *ḥikmī* for the major dichotomy, as opposed, e.g., to the pair *sharʿī-falsafī* in the *Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ*, gives us a certain indication about al-ʿĀmirī’s vantage point. On the one hand, he, like al-Fārābī, is thinking of a plurality of religions,<sup>28</sup> and thus uses a term derived from *milla*, “religion, i.e. religious community”; on the other hand, he wants to assuage and convince the Islamic religious establishment concerning the value of philosophy, and thus uses a term derived from *ḥikma* which, though often employed to render “philosophy”, originally meant “wisdom”, especially in the sense of “words of wisdom”. It has been pointed out that, among Greek philosophical literature, the gnomologies were the genre most readily accepted outside philosophical circles.<sup>29</sup> The term *ḥikmī* seems therefore carefully chosen. After all, the overall goal of the book is to defuse a serious criticism that religious scholars might bring against philosophy, namely that from the vantage point of the philosopher all religions would be equal. The title of the book shows the author’s intentions quite unambiguously, and he sets out to prove his point extensively.

The mirror-image relationship that al-ʿĀmirī has constructed between religious and philosophical sciences fails to be convincing in all cases where *ḥiss*, “sense perception”, plays a role, because the author has conveniently swept the difference between “sense perception of any kind” (in philosophy) and “perception of language” (in religion) under the carpet. But the item we are interested in here presents no such difficulties. As the counterpart of logic, which is

<sup>28</sup> He follows Sūra 22,17, in assuming the existence of six religious groups: Muslims, Jews, Sabians, Christians, Magians (Zoroastrians), and Idolaters, see al-ʿĀmirī, *al-Fīlām* (as in n.27) 123.

<sup>29</sup> E. Rowson, “The Philosopher as Littérateur: al-Tawḥīdī and His Predecessors”, *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der arabisch-islamischen Wissenschaften* 6 (1990) 50-92, 59.

the organon of philosophy, we find *ṣināʿat al-lughā*, “the art of language”, as the organon of the religious sciences. This is convincing in two ways: the linguistic disciplines have indeed been seen as an *ancilla theologiae* (cf., e.g., al-Khuwārizmī above), and the similarity and/or difference between grammar and logic was a topic of immense interest, particularly among the philosophers. The name *ṣināʿat al-lughā* should not be understood in the narrow sense of “lexicography”, but more as linguistic disciplines in general. It is revealing that a few pages later, in another enumeration of the religious sciences, the *ṣināʿat al-lughā* is replaced by *ṣināʿat al-adab*, which on the next page is referred to as *ʿilm al-lughā*, and the designation *ṣināʿat al-adab* recurs later in the book.<sup>30</sup> There can thus be no doubt that *adab* here refers to the language disciplines. And, in fact, in the context of the second mention of *ṣināʿat al-adab*, the author enumerates the various fields of the *adab* specialists (*udabāʾ*) as follows: *ṣināʿat al-naḥw*, “syntax”, *ṣināʿat al-ʿarūd*, “prosody”, *ṣināʿat al-taṣrīf*, “morphology”, and *ṣināʿat al-taqfiya*, “rhyme theory”.<sup>31</sup>

As an appendix to the classification proper, we find a few pages later the following unexpected passage:<sup>32</sup>

We have found that some pious people (*nussāk*) reject *al-ādāb* and claim that whoever is eager to acquire them will be one of the following two types: either someone whose ambition it is to be praised for his eloquence (*lasan*) and pure speech, or someone who will strut with them in front of the mighty and the noble to reach by their splendour profit and position. Both are beguiled away from [their] attachment to worship or from [their] pursuit of wisdom [philosophy]. This also is a bad mistake on the part of these people, because it is a discipline (*ṣināʿa*) dependent on clarity (*bayān*) which, with regard to impressionable souls (*al-anfus al-laṭīfa*) is like a bridle and a restraint, since the eloquent speaker becomes empowered through it to pull them [the souls] from one state to another. Now, the relationship of the words to their meanings is utterly similar to the relationship of the souls to their bodies. And just as the noble souls will not bring forth their praiseworthy deeds, except in bodies characterised by an excellent humoural mixture, likewise the formation of truthful meanings will be brought about only by pleasant words. The Messenger of God—may God bless him and give him peace—has said: There is magic in lucid expression. What’s more, God Most High has said: He created man,

<sup>30</sup> *F̣lām* 110, 111, and 180.

<sup>31</sup> *F̣lām* 182.

<sup>32</sup> *F̣lām* 96-97.



taught him lucid expression [Sūra 55,4]. Therefore, wide-ranging mastery in the language is not intended for a thorough command of its purity (*faṣāḥa*), it is rather intended to achieve natural<sup>33</sup> speech in the way of poetry, speeches, epistles, and proverbs. For all four of these divisions (of speech) contain valuable elements like well-crafted aphorisms and striking similes that can be used to sharpen the mind. It is for this reason that they have been eternalised in books; because of its exceptional durability one even says: They are living speech. Furthermore, whoever considers the result they produce at councils convened to mend discord and the strong effect they have in dispelling mutual enmity and dislike, in attracting the hearts of kings and nobles, and in presenting a beautiful vision of the noble deeds and good words that are related about them, [whoever considers this] will be certain that anyone who attempts to discredit them [i.e., the works of verbal art] (thereby) has the audacity to belittle something that is weighty and important. Indeed, their memorisation and transmission incites high minds to strive for the noble deed and induces those who enjoy listening to them to acquire a share of them for themselves by which to adorn their conversation.

This passage is mysterious in several respects. First, given al-ʿĀmirī's well-balanced construction of a system of sciences, it looks rather like a clumsy afterthought. One wonders where the *ādāb* would fit in the overall scheme. Since the passage follows an apology of logic (*manṭiq*), Biesterfeldt assumes that the *ādāb* are conceived of as a science auxiliary to logic.<sup>34</sup> But there is nothing within the passage that would lead one to think so. Arkoun, in one place, equates these *ādāb* with *adab* as the organon of the religious sciences, while at another place he separates *ādāb* from *adab* by assigning the *ādāb* to the philosophical sciences—thus coming close to Biesterfeldt's view—and *adab* to the religious sciences.<sup>35</sup> It seems, however, that *ādāb* and *adab* should not be equated. *Ṣināʿat al-adab*, as indicated above, is synonymous with *ṣināʿat al-lughā* and *ʿilm al-lughā* and thus refers to the language sciences that serve as an organon to the religious sciences. The *ādāb*, however, clearly go beyond mere correct and chaste usage, since they are characterised by terms like *bayān*, “lucid expression”, *alfāz shahīya*, “pleasant words”, *al-ittisāʿ fī l-lughā*,

<sup>33</sup> Assuming that *munṭabīʿ* is used for *maṭbūʿ*.

<sup>34</sup> “Abūl-Ḥasan al-ʿĀmirī” (as in n.27) 338.

<sup>35</sup> M. Arkoun, “Logocentrisme et vérité religieuse dans la pensée islamique d’après al-ʿĪlām bi-manāqib al-Islām d’al-ʿĀmirī”, in: idem, *Essais sur la pensée islamique* (Paris 1973) 185-231, 214 and 211 (the latter in a diagram of the division of sciences).

“wide-ranging mastery in the language”, and *al-ḥikam al-balīgha wa-l-tashbīhāt al-‘ajība*, “well-crafted aphorisms and striking similes”, all of which point in one direction: the notion of eloquence (*balāgha*) which in turn informs all the literary genres mentioned in the passage. How should we translate the two terms? In the case of *ṣinā‘at al-adab* the most appropriate would be “the art of philology”, in the older more comprehensive sense of the philologist being an amateur and scholar of language and literature. For *ādāb*, grammatically a plural of *adab*, the author’s intentions are not so clear. The word is often used to denote (a) “modes of correct and refined behaviour” and (b) “sayings that express such modes”; in the latter case the word becomes more or less synonymous with *ḥikam*. However, it does not seem likely that the author intended something like a corpus of sayings. Rather, he is thinking of certain modes or modules that generate such sayings, so that the best translation would be “stylistic moulds”.

Another mystery in this passage is the identity of the pious people or ascetics (*nussāk*) who reject the *ādāb*. One intriguing bit of information can be gleaned from the text itself: these ascetics say that those who try to acquire the *ādāb* are “beguiled away from [their] attachment to worship or from [their] pursuit of wisdom”. The paired terms “worship” and “wisdom” clearly reflects the dichotomy “religion”-“philosophy”. If so, the *nussāk* would not exclusively advocate religious pursuits (in the strict sense of the word); their opposition would be to the beautification of language in all of the sciences; and al-‘Āmirī’s counterattack would mean that the *ādāb* encompass the whole system of classification and affect all the sciences.

Finally, in another, later, work al-‘Āmirī hints at a different classification of sciences.<sup>36</sup> Since the religious sciences are entirely left out, it cannot have been intended as a complete system. Here the opposite number of philosophy is played by philology, and al-‘Āmirī again creates a beautiful parallelism:

---

<sup>36</sup> *Kitāb al-Amad ‘alā l-abad*. See Rowson, *A Muslim Philosopher* (as in n.27) 60-61, 188-189. The work is dated 375/985-6 (see p.7), and cites the *I‘lām* in the introduction.

**Philology**

| field                                                                                    | practitioner                        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>ḥifẓ al-lughā</i><br>(memorisation of<br>the lexicon)                                 | <i>luḡhawī</i> (lexico-<br>grapher) |
| <i>ʿilm al-iʿrāb</i><br>(science of inflec-<br>tion)                                     | <i>naḡwī</i><br>(grammarian)        |
| <i>qawānīn al-ʿarūd</i><br>(rules of prosody)                                            | <i>ʿarūdī</i><br>(prosodist)        |
| Combination of all<br>three, with the re-<br>sult of being able to<br>produce verbal art | <i>adīb</i><br>(philologist)        |

**Philosophy**

| field                                                                                                     | practitioner                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>ʿilm al-maḡādir</i><br>(science of<br>measures)                                                        | <i>muḡandīs</i><br>(geometer)    |
| <i>ʿilm al-ṭabāʿiʿ</i><br>(physics)                                                                       | <i>ṭabīʿī</i><br>(physicist)     |
| <i>qawānīn al-mantiq</i><br>(rules of logic)                                                              | <i>mantiqī</i><br>(logician)     |
| Combination of all<br>three, with the re-<br>sult of being able to<br>ascertain meta-<br>physical matters | <i>ḡaylasūf</i><br>(philosopher) |

It is not clear whether the rows as they appear in the diagram are so intended by the author, because in his linear presentation he may have switched the places of one or the other discipline. E.g., one might imagine that the *luḡhā*, being the material aspect of the language, should go with the *ṭabāʿiʿ* as the material aspect of the world. Nor is it clear whether this is more than a clever tour de force, showing (or, maybe, forcing) structural isomorphies between two fields of intellectual pursuit. But one thing is clear: the *adīb* is introduced here as one of two types of scholars of a higher level who combine several specialties in one general field. This is very close to what we have set out to look for.

## 7. ABŪ ḤAYYĀN AL-TAWḤĪDĪ

Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī's *Risāla fī l-ʿulūm*, "Epistle on the Sciences", is a short work with a curious arrangement.<sup>37</sup> After two chapters on the religious sciences (jurisprudence and theology) there follow two chapters on linguistic disciplines (syntax and lexicon). Next are five Greek sciences (logic, medicine, astronomy-astrology, arithmetic, and geometry)—all of which, it should be noted, are eminently practical. There is no mention of philosophy or metaphysics.

<sup>37</sup> M. Bergé, "Épître sur les sciences (*Risāla fī l-ʿUlūm*) d'Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī (310/922(?)-414/1023). Introduction, traduction, glossaire technique, manuscrit et édition critique", *Bulletin d'Études Orientales* 18 (1963-64) 241-300.

The last two chapters look strangely out of place; they are *balāgha* “eloquence” and *taṣawwuf* “mysticism”. The section on “eloquence” is thus strangely divorced from the linguistic disciplines. However, at the beginning of the section the author makes the point that the specialist in eloquence looks into each and every of the preceding sciences.<sup>38</sup> In a way, thus, the position of eloquence is similar to the position of the *ādāb* in al-ʿĀmirī, which we have interpreted above as an expertise that encompasses all other sciences.

At the beginning of his enumeration Abū Ḥayyān states that he will be very succinct, since classifications of the sciences have already been produced. He mentions three groups of scholars who have had their say in this respect: the teachers of [religious] knowledge (*shuyūkh al-ʿilm*), the masters of wisdom/philosophy (*arbāb al-ḥikma*), and the heroes of philology (*fursān al-adab*). This division of scholars could be considered a blueprint for the enumeration of the sciences, except that the philological sciences precede the philosophical ones. If only *en passant*, the three types of the *faqīh*, *ḥakīm*, and *adīb* are clearly introduced.

The result of this rapid survey would seem to be inconclusive. The approaches of the authors here passed in review are too different to allow for easy generalisations. There is as yet no clear idea of a set of disciplines that may be called *al-ʿulūm al-adabiyya*. But some trends are already discernible. Al-Fārābī’s “science of the language” prefigures the later *adab* discipline, but since this science is at the beginning of the historical development and of the curriculum, the *adīb* would be hardly more than a proto-philosopher, on the one hand, and an auxiliary scholar, on the other. Also, it is noteworthy that in the more practically oriented works of Ibn al-Nadīm and al-Khuwārizmī the *adab* disciplines, though not explicitly recognised as such, are clearly juxtaposed. In al-ʿĀmirī and in al-Tawḥīdī the linguistic disciplines are separated from eloquence which is an all-encompassing discipline with both authors. Al-ʿĀmirī constitutes the “science of philology” (*ṣināʿat al-adab*) as an organon for the religious sciences, as does al-Khuwārizmī in a less rigorous fashion. In all these cases, *adab*, whether mentioned by this name or not, is not yet an autonomous area. It is only in al-Tawḥīdī’s brief mention of

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibidem 289, l.9.

the groups of authors who have had an interest in classification that we have a hint. On the whole, it seems that the somewhat heterogeneous and ill-defined *adab* disciplines posed a certain difficulty to the rigorous classifier. For more successful attempts one has to go to later centuries.

As mentioned above, the first list of the *‘ulūm adabiyya* is to be found in al-Zamakhsharī’s work on prosody. Here they are twelve in all. An almost identical list is included by al-Zanjānī (alive in 660/1261-62) in his book on the poetic sciences.<sup>39</sup>

| al-Zamakhsharī                                          | al-Zanjānī                                      |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <i>‘ilm matn al-lughā</i> (lexicon)                  | 1) dto.                                         |
| 2) <i>‘ilm al-abniya</i> (morphology)                   | 2) <i>‘ilm al-taṣrīf</i> (dto.)                 |
| 3) <i>‘ilm al-ishtiḳāq</i> (derivation)                 | 3) dto.                                         |
| 4) <i>‘ilm al-iṣrāb</i> (syntax)                        | 4) dto.                                         |
| 5) <i>‘ilm al-ma‘ānī</i> (stylistics)                   | 5) dto.                                         |
| 6) <i>‘ilm al-bayān</i> (theory of tropical expression) | 6) dto.                                         |
| 7) <i>‘ilm al-‘arūd</i> (prosody)                       | 7) dto.                                         |
| 8) <i>‘ilm al-qawāfi</i> (rhyme lore)                   | 8) dto.                                         |
| 9) <i>inshā’ al-nathr</i> (writing of prose)            | 9) dto.                                         |
| 10) <i>qarḍ al-shi‘r</i> (composing of poetry)          | 10) dto.                                        |
| 11) <i>‘ilm al-kitāba</i> (scribal art)                 | 11) <i>‘ilm al-khaṭṭ</i> (calligraphy)          |
| 12) <i>‘ilm al-muḥāḍarāt</i> (art of quotation)         | 12) dto. (plus:<br><i>wa-minhu l-tawārīkh</i> ) |

Both authors present their lists without further ado as a generally accepted truth. Al-Zanjānī is close enough to al-Zamakhsharī to assume dependency; the changes are clarifications. The term *‘ilm al-taṣrīf*, “knowledge of inflection”, is certainly more common for

<sup>39</sup> al-Zanjānī, *Mi‘yār al-nuẓẓār fī ‘ulūm al-ash‘ār*, ed. Muḥammad ‘Alī Rizq al-Khafājī, 2 vols. (Cairo 1991) i, 1.

“morphology” than *‘ilm al-abniya*, “knowledge of patterns”, and *‘ilm al-khaṭṭ*, “knowledge of handwriting/script”, removes the ambiguity of *‘ilm al-kitāba*, “knowledge of writing/scrabal arts”, because the latter includes, along with writing and calligraphy, all the administrative faculties that a scribe must master. There are some idiosyncrasies in al-Zanjānī’s brief notes on some of these sciences (his definitions of *‘ilm al-ma‘ānī* and *‘ilm al-bayān* and the fact that he subsumes these two sciences under the general title of *‘ilm al-badī‘*) which cannot be discussed here. Al-Zamakhsharī’s list, too, does not look like his own construction and is tucked away in an inconspicuous place, which in all likelihood means that it was already very current at his time.

It is worth noticing here that all subfields are subsumed under the category *‘ilm* “science”, except for the the two creative activities, the writing of prose and the composition of poetry, which are, however, both assigned to the domain of the *‘ulūm adabiyya*. The knowledge of literary texts (poetic, ornate prosaic, proverbial, historical-anecdotal, including Koranic and Ḥadīth), which is expected from the *adīb*, is here hidden under the rubric *‘ilm al-muḥāḍarāt*, which one might translate as “the art of quotation”. The *adīb* is trained to know by heart, on any conceivable topic, all the relevant quotable materials from all the genres just mentioned. The lists thus contain four linguistic, two rhetorical, two prosodical, two creative, one scriptorial, and one literary field of expertise. No glaring gaps are obvious.

The problem posed at the beginning has here been approached from one angle only, that of the classification of knowledge. The texts of the fourth/tenth century are original and, consequently, highly nonhomogeneous, but certain trends toward their establishment of *adab* as an autonomous field have nevertheless been identified.



# BAGHDAD, BOLOGNA, AND SCHOLASTICISM

GEORGE MAKDISI

This paper has three main concerns: first, the influence of religion on the organisation of learning; second, how the organisation of higher learning in classical Islam was received in the Christian West; and third, how this new organisation of higher learning created, in addition to the two traditional powers, the papacy and the empire, a new power in the Christian West, to the exclusion of the Christian East.

## I. LEARNING AND RELIGION

The learning which developed in the Baghdad of classical Islam was characterised by professional institutions, the first of their kind in known history, based on a legal form of perpetuity. These institutions differed from those of classical antiquity, as well as from the monastic schools of Eastern Christendom, and from the monastic and cathedral schools of Western Christendom. Baghdad was the home of the scholastic movement. This movement created the college of classical Islam, and, later in the Christian West, served to provide the basic learning structure for the university. In speaking of the medieval institutions of learning, Charles Homer Haskins said that "we were the heirs, not of Athens and Alexandria, but of Paris and Bologna". To this it may be said that Bologna and Paris were, in turn, the heirs of Baghdad.

This is not to say, however, that classical antiquity had no hand in the making of medieval learning which had its rise in Baghdad, and which, in its essential elements, has come down to our times. For the philosophical thought of Greek antiquity was the triggering mechanism that gave rise to the Traditionalist religious forces of Islam in reaction to the intrusion of non-theistic thought. But before dealing with this development, which concentrated on the process of determining orthodoxy in Islam, let us first see what this process was in Islam before the intrusion of the philosophical thought of classical antiquity. For it was the Islamic Traditionalist reaction that produced the new organisation of higher learning, which in itself was



aimed at placing the process of determining orthodoxy securely in the hands of the Traditionalists of classical Islam.

### 1. *The Process of Determining Orthodoxy in Early Islam*

The basic element of the teaching function in early Islam was the *fatwa*, the opinion of the expert in the revealed law given to the layman soliciting it for guidance relating to matters of a civil or religious character; for Islamic law covered both aspects of life. Muslims have considered the Prophet as the first mufti of Islam. In this capacity he was followed by his Companions and their successors, who were learned in the Sacred Scriptures: the Koran and the Prophetic Traditions. The fatwa, legal opinion or *responsum*, was arrived at through the individual mufti's personal research, which opinion he professed in complete freedom from any and all external forces. The layman, for his part, was free to consult as many muftis as he wished and could afford, and was free to choose one opinion from among those received. His choice invested the opinion with orthodoxy on the first level; for there were two levels of orthodoxy, the second being that of the unanimous consensus of the religious intellectuals, representing the Islamic Community. The fact that the layman was free to consult more than one mufti led to the proliferation of legal opinions which, in turn, gave rise to conflicting opinions. The practice of disputation determined eventually which opinion was considered the strongest, and thus achieved unanimous consensus, and orthodoxy on the second level. However, in the event that no one opinion succeeded in achieving unanimous consensus, the two opposing opinions on any one question were considered equally orthodox. This was the significance of the *sic et non*, 'yes and no', the disputed questions.

As there was no formal organisation in Islam to determine orthodoxy by arriving at consensus through a show of hands, consensus was arrived at negatively when there was no known authoritative dissent against a given opinion. This was determined retroactively, in the following generation, when there was no possibility of the mufti going back on his opinion. Furthermore, the unanimous consensus was provisional when, on the basis of new data, authoritative dissent made its appearance. Works on the *sic et non* constitute the most prolific legal literature of Islam, beginning with the first Islamic century, the seventh of our era. The *sic et non* served the purpose of

showing which opinions had achieved consensus and which had not; it served the purpose of pointing out what was orthodox on the first level in a given jurisconsult's opinion, and what was orthodox on the second level in the jurisconsult's opinion, which achieved unanimous consensus. Thus the *sic et non* was Islam's way of recording the materials necessary for the determination of its orthodoxy, and incidentally, for the history of the development of its orthodoxy.

## 2. *Intrusion of the Non-Theistic Thought of Classical Antiquity*

Such was the situation in early Islam, before the intrusion of the non-theistic thought of classical antiquity. With the influx of Greek works from Byzantium, a translation movement began under Caliph Harun ar-Rashid and continued on a much greater scale under his son, Caliph al-Ma'mun, making possible the assimilation of their contents. This activity gave rise to two antagonistic religious movements. The first was a Rationalist movement which, in its attempt to Islamise Greek thought, created a philosophical theology. This reaction gave rise, in turn, to a second reaction, that of a Traditionalist movement which, in calling Islam back to the message of the Prophet, created a juridical theology, based on the revealed law of the Sacred Scriptures. Both movements were religious and claimed adherence to faith and reason, with this distinction that the Rationalists gave primacy to reason, while the Traditionalists gave primacy to faith. The struggle between the two movements brought on the Inquisition (*Mihna*) of the ninth century, sanctioned by the Caliph al-Ma'mun, in which the Rationalists performed the role of inquisitors. After fifteen years, and a change of heart on the part of its fourth caliph, al-Mutawakkil, the Inquisition ended in the failure of its Rationalist perpetrators and the triumph of its Traditionalist victims.

## 3. *The Professional Organisation of Higher Learning*

These two movements had struggled for control of the process leading to the determination of orthodoxy, based on the opinions of the religious intellectuals. The Traditionalist intellectuals, having emerged triumphant, began to put together an organisation that would stand as a bulwark against both the governing power and the Rationalist movement. This organisation was so conceived as to

protect the Traditionalist structure against two adversaries: a governing power on whose continued support the Traditionalists preferred not to depend, and an ideological adversary whom they desired to exclude from the process of determining orthodoxy, while preserving this process in perpetuity for themselves. To these ends, the Traditionalists, as heirs of the Prophet, unilaterally formed themselves into a *guild* to protect and promote their common interests. They then created guild colleges, based on the law of the charitable trust, the only form of legal perpetuity in Islam. The founders of these colleges, in their status as solvent Muslim individuals, including jurisconsults, established their foundations for the express purpose of producing jurisconsults, who were both jurists and juridical theologians, professional experts in the religious law the methodology of which served also as a juridical theology.

The course of study consisted of four undergraduate years, after the basic literary studies of the elementary-secondary schools, specialising in the religious law, and ten or more graduate years, leading to a 'licence to teach'. The graduate students were trained in the scholastic method of research and disputation, consisting of three essential elements: the *sic et non*, dialectic, and disputation. Ancillary studies in the curriculum included the sciences of the Sacred Scriptures, i.e. the Koran, the Hadith or Prophetic Traditions, grammar, including literature, and the art of the academic sermon. Excluded outright from the curriculum were philosophy and philosophical theology. This method of training, called in Islam 'the method of disputation', and later called in the Christian West, the 'scholastic method', led the successful graduate student to 'the licence to teach', the Arabic *ijazat at-tadris*, and the later medieval Latin *licentia docendi*. This licence, in classical Islam, represented not only competence, but also, and very significantly, a jurisdictional authority to participate in the determination of orthodoxy.

Before the advent of this professional training in higher learning in classical Islam, any Muslim who claimed to know something of the Sacred Scriptures could issue legal opinions to the faithful. With the advent of this professional training leading to the licence to teach, the doctorate, only the doctors of the law, equipped with the licence to teach, had the jurisdictional authority to engage in this religious function of issuing legal opinions. The full technical term for the licence was 'the licence to teach and to issue legal opinions' (*ijazat at-tadris wa 'l-ifta'*), i.e., to teach law in the colleges of the legal

guilds, and to issue *responsa* to the faithful soliciting them for guidance in the conduct of their lives. This was the process of orthodox life in Islam, for Islam had no councils or synods to determine orthodoxy; it did so on the basis of the legal opinions of its jurisconsults; henceforth, only the doctors of the law among them could successfully engage in this process, which called for highly sophisticated competence in dialectic and disputation, acquired in the professional schools of the legal guilds. Orthodoxy continued to be determined as before: in the first instance, by the legal opinion of the individual jurisconsult, now the professional doctor of the law; and in the second instance, by the unanimous consensus of these jurisconsults, as the authoritative representatives of the Islamic Community.

Such, briefly, was the two-fold solution arrived at by the Traditionalists, as a bulwark against external forces: on the one hand, religious and financial independence *vis-à-vis* the governing power, based on the guild structure and the private endowments of the charitable trust; and on the other hand, the professional training and licensing of the doctor of the law, excluding the philosophical theologians from participating, as such, in the process of determining orthodoxy. Any Muslim wishing to participate in the process had to submit to the scholastic system of education, through the long undergraduate and graduate years, in order to obtain the licence authorising him to do so, in his capacity as doctor of the law.

The success of this Traditionalist scholastic movement may be seen in the fact that philosophers and philosophical theologians joined the scholastic movement by becoming jurisconsults, while keeping their interest in philosophy and philosophical theology, outside the boundaries of institutionalised higher learning.

#### 4. *Islamic Antecedents of the Professional Organisation of Higher Learning*

The new professional higher learning in Islam was the result of an evolutionary, rather than a revolutionary, change in the system of education; for the schools of Islamic scholasticism were developed from pre-existing institutions. For instance, the college was a two-stage development from the small mosque called *masjid*. In the first stage, an inn was added, adjacent to the mosque, for students from out-of-town; this mosque-inn complex flourished in the tenth century. It was followed, in the second stage, by the *madrassa* which combined the functions of the mosque, or place of study, and the inn,

or place of lodging, into an architectural whole; this madrasa-college flourished in the eleventh century and thereafter, without replacing the mosque-inn complex, which continued to find its philanthropic founders.

The elements of the scholastic method and the licence to teach were also developed from pre-existing elements. For instance, the *sic et non* method, as already mentioned, was in use as of the first century of Islam, the seventh of our era; so also was disputation in which the various conflicting legal opinions were argued; but disputation was not raised to the level of an art until dialectic, particularly elements of the eighth book of the *Topics* of Aristotle, was assimilated and used by the jurisconsults in writing their books on dialectic (*jadal*), and in applying it to their practice of disputation. As for the licence to *teach* law, it was an extension of the licence to *transmit* the Prophetic Traditions. The original licence was referred to simply as the *ijaza*, licence, authorisation; that of scholasticism was called *ijazat at-tadris*, 'the licence to teach', the full term being *ijazat at-tadris wa 'l-ifta'*, 'the licence to teach law and issue legal opinions'.

## II. TRANSMISSION OF HIGHER LEARNING

In his excellent little booklet, *The Rise of Universities*, Charles Homer Haskins makes the following statement:

It is hard, even for the modern world, to realise that many things had no founder or fixed date of beginning but instead "just grew," arising slowly and silently without definite record. This explains why, in spite of all the researches of Father Denifle and Hastings Rashdall and the local antiquaries, the beginnings of the oldest universities are obscure and often uncertain, so that we must content ourselves sometimes with very general statements.<sup>1</sup>

The same may be said of the Islamic colleges. The reason for the obscurity in the case of Islam is that the deeds of charitable trust on which the earliest colleges were based are no longer extant. We have only a few lines of the foundation deed of the eleventh-century Nisamiya College of Baghdad; it preserves the curriculum of the college and its teaching personnel. Of the earliest institutions of scholastic learning, whether in classical Islam or in the Christian

---

<sup>1</sup> C.H. Haskins, *The Rise of Universities* (Ithaca 1957; 1st ed. 1923) 3-4.

West, we are not likely to discover their exact dates of foundation. What we can know, in an approximate way, is that those of Islam began in the tenth century, and those of the Christian West, in the twelfth.

### 1. *Original Motive for the Rise of Professional Higher Learning*

What really matters, however, when dealing with the transmission of learning, is not so much the *exact* date of foundation, but the reason for the new organisation of higher learning, the motive behind the essential elements of the organisational structure. Nor does it matter, in this regard, that the Islamic college is based on the charitable trust, or that the university is based on the corporation; what matters most of all is that the students of both institutions trained in the same scholastic method and obtained the same licence to teach, to which they aspired as the crowning achievement of their long years of study. It is these elements that point to one source, classical Islam, where the antecedents for the new organisation and the motives for its existence are to be found.

### 2. *The Scholastic Method and the Transmission of Professional Higher Learning*

Thus, the way to approach the problem of the transmission of the organisation of higher learning is by way of the scholastic method and the licence to teach, not by way of the legal status of the Islamic college or the Christian university. For it is through the analysis of scholasticism that we can see the institutional relationship between the scholastic movement in classical Islam and that of the Christian West. It is also through such analysis that we can arrive at a common definition of its institutions of learning, whether this be the Islamic college or the Christian university. For these may be defined simply as institutions in which the scholastic method is taught, leading to the licence to teach. This definition holds for classical Islam and the Christian West in medieval times; it also holds for the Modern West where elements of the method are still recognisable and where the licence is still in force. The legal status of the Islamic college or of the Christian University simply affords us a definition of the specific institution.

In the early scholarly studies of the university and the curricula—

by such eminent scholars as Denifle<sup>2</sup>, Rashdall<sup>3</sup>, Rashdall's editors, Emden and Powicke<sup>4</sup>, and finally Haskins<sup>5</sup>, and the comprehensive study of the scholastic method by Martin Grabmann<sup>6</sup>, the only one of its kind—one can clearly see the connection between the university and the scholastic method; and this connection, between the Islamic college and the scholastic method, has more recently been made clear in my study, *The Rise of Colleges*.<sup>7</sup> In other words, the common denominator in all of these studies is the scholastic method, with its theses, whose function it was (and still remains) to lead to the doctorate.

The new organisation of higher learning in Islam consisted in professionalising a pre-existent system, and in monopolising the licence to teach and restricting it to the field of legal studies. If this was a revolutionary change, it was not so much in concept and organisation, for these pre-dated the Inquisition, but rather in making the organisation professional, autonomous, exclusive and monopolistic. In the Christian West, however, it was nothing less than a revolution in the twelfth century, both as to the new form of organisation as well as to the licence to teach, constituting a radical departure from Western antecedents and the introduction of an intrusive element with serious consequences to the mode of determining Christian orthodoxy, as will be seen presently.

In approaching the problem of the transmission of learning, it is not enough to ask 'What is a university?', as Rashdall did in his history of universities; such a question must be preceded by others,

<sup>2</sup> H. Denifle, *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400* (Berlin 1885; photomechanical reprint, Graz 1956).

<sup>3</sup> H. Rashdall (1895), *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden, 3 vols. (Oxford 1936) lays emphasis on the personality of Abelard and the importance of Paris in the development of the university.

<sup>4</sup> Rashdall's editors, F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden, point out that both Denifle and Rashdall tend to connect the university with the *licentia docendi*.

<sup>5</sup> Haskins, in his *The Rise of Universities* (as in n.1) lays stress on the permanence of the university and on what has come down to us from the universities of the Middle Ages; and in his other original studies on culture and science, he shows the connection between the university and Islamic science; see his *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge Mass. 1927) and his *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (New York 1965; repr. of the 1st ed. of 1929).

<sup>6</sup> M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, 2 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau 1909-1911; photomechanical reprint, Graz 1957), seeks the origins and development of the Scholastic Method.

<sup>7</sup> G. Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges: Institutions of learning in Islam and the West* (Edinburgh 1981).

more fundamental: 'What is scholasticism?' and 'What was the motivation that brought scholasticism and its institutions into existence?' The answers to such questions can only come from classical Islam, where the origins of the movement and its fundamental institutions are found, along with the cause of their existence and the motives that gave them their shape. Although Denifle and Rashdall have not been able to clarify the beginnings of the oldest universities, as Haskins says, it is to their credit that they both tended to see a relation between the university and the *licentia docendi*, the licence to teach. As for the university as an institution, it is often stated to have been the result of a 'natural and spontaneous development'. But social institutions have their antecedents in established tradition. A culture in which institutions cannot be related to indigenous antecedents must have received those institutions from an external source, i.e. a culture having the requisite indigenous antecedents. This is the case with respect to the scholastic method and the licence to teach, both of which are found in the Christian university, which could only have received them from classical Islam; for they existed in no other known culture. What was received from classical Islam was not a matter of some disparate institutions; it was a completely constituted organisational structure, a complete model.

### 3. *The Transmission Clearly Seen in the Scholastic Method and the Licence to Teach*

It is in the essential elements of the scholastic method and in the licence to teach that we find the Christian West intimately related to classical Islam. This relation is obscured when we compare the university with the Islamic college, for they belong to two different forms of social organisation. In other words, to know what a university is, we must seek the reasons *why it came into existence, replacing the cathedral schools and the monastic schools that preceded it. For the solution to the puzzle lies in the reason why teaching in higher learning was made, for the first time in history, the prerogative of licensed intellectuals—to the exclusion of all others.* As already seen, the new organisation of higher learning was a creation of the Traditionalists, whose motive was to exclude the Rationalists from the process of determining orthodoxy; and they based it on the guild in order to achieve autonomy *vis-à-vis* the governing power; for, in Islam, it was possible to institute a guild without reference to the governing power.



#### 4. *Bologna at the Origin of the Transmission from Islam*

The Islamic scholastic movement, with its guilds, its colleges, its scholastic method, and its licence, found its way to the Christian West. This transmission of knowledge can be verified through the experience of Bologna, where a basic element of the scholastic method, i.e. the *sic et non*, first made its appearance. Historians have generally believed that the Justinian *Corpus Iuris Civilis* was discovered in the first half of the eleventh century; but legal historians have recently pointed out that the Justinian *Corpus* had been steadily used in Italy, except for one of its parts, the *Digest*, which had been neglected. What was new was the interest in studying the *Digest*, after it had long been neglected. The neglect is mentioned by the medieval chronicler, Burchard of Ursperg. This new interest has intrigued Western historians, and the answers recently given have already been declared inadequate.<sup>8</sup> In this case, as in others, I believe that the Islamic scholastic method has an adequate answer.

Let us look at the composition of this *Corpus*. It is composed of four parts: the *Code*, the *Novels*, the *Institutes*, and the *Digest*. The *Code* deals with laws under the emperors before Justinian, and the *Novels*, with Justinian's laws. The *Institutes* is a textbook that was studied by beginners in Roman law. These three parts of the *Corpus* were readily usable. But the *Digest*, consisting of more than half of all the other parts put together, was neglected, because it consisted, not of imperial decisions that could be readily used, but of legal opinions of Roman jurists, often conflicting.

The awakened interest of the Italian jurists to the *Digest* points to the reception of the Islamic scholastic method in Italy. For this method was specifically created to deal with conflicting legal opinions. In other words, the study of the *Digest* was made possible by the reception of the Islamic scholastic method in Bologna. What gave rise to the scholastic guild school in the Christian West was therefore not primarily a matter of personalities, whether that of Irnerius or of Abelard, but of the Islamic scholastic method and its application to conflicting opinions. This method was used in three types of such opinions: (1) legal opinions in the Roman law of the *Digest*, in the law

---

<sup>8</sup> C.M. Radding, *The Origins of Medieval Jurisprudence: Pavia and Bologna 850-1150* (New Haven 1988) 181ff.

school of Irnerius; (2) legal opinions in Canon law, in Gratian's *Concordance of discordant canons*; and (3) theological opinions in Abelard's *Sic et Non*. And this began in the early part of the twelfth century, in the school of Irnerius.

The Islamic scholastic method had been created for the express purpose of dealing with the legal opinions of Muslim jurisconsults. The fact that the *Digest* began to be put to use by the Italian jurists in the twelfth century is, in my view, a clue to the reception of the scholastic method and its use for the purpose for which it was intended, this time with respect to the legal opinions of the *Digest*. Furthermore, the law school founded for Irnerius to teach Roman Law was modelled on the Islamic law school. It was, to all appearances, based on the charitable trust, founded as it was by Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, expressly for Irnerius, in the same manner that an Islamic law school was founded on the basis of a charitable trust, expressly for a particular professor of law, and the method used to teach the students was the scholastic method of Islam, consisting of the *sic et non*, dialectic, and disputation.

But let us stop for a moment in order to consider some questions that have been raised by certain historians who, in reference to institutions on both sides of the Mediterranean, see what they consider to be fundamental differences between the two intellectual cultures, those of classical Islam and the Christian West. Two such questions have been raised: one with respect to the difference between the college and the university, the other with respect to the personnel granting the licence to teach.

As regards the university, one author has quoted my statement that, "the university, as a form of social organisation, owes nothing to Islam." The key words here are 'form of social organisation', for the Islamic college and the Christian university are two different 'forms of social organisation'. The Islamic form of social organisation is based on the charitable trust; the Western Christian form, on the corporation. The first institution of learning of scholasticism was the Islamic college; the second, the Christian university. Islam had only one form of legal perpetuity: the charitable trust; the Christian West had two: the corporation based on juristic personality, as well as the charitable trust which, in my view, was received from Islam. There was no concept of juristic personality in Islamic law; for it recognised only the natural physical person as endowed with juristic

personality. Islam had no universities until modern times when it, in turn, borrowed from the West the concept of the university, together with that of juristic personality on which it is based.

Naturally, if the question were simply a matter of whether the university came from Islam, there would be an end to the discussion as regards Islamic influence on the Christian West. But the university is only one type of institution of learning that the scholastic movement created, the other type, the college, being the first. Scholasticism's first institution of learning was the college. Likewise, in Bologna, the first known school of law, that of Irnerius, was of the Islamic college variety. In medieval London, the Inns of Court were created for training lawyers of common law in the scholastic method, and they too were of the Islamic college variety. Thus the scholastic method was taught in more than one particular type of institution of learning, inns, colleges and universities, as well as in institutions fusing the latter two into one, the college-university of Spain, Scotland, Ireland and Colonial America. In all of these institutions, the method was that of scholasticism, and it led eventually to the licence to teach.

Another author has mentioned the fact that in Islam the licence to teach was granted in the name of a single professor; alluding no doubt to the fact that in the Christian West the licence was granted by the cathedral chancellor, or by the bishop, and eventually by the faculty. This is true, but it is also a fact that early on, in more than one instance, and in more than one country, the licence was also granted in universities of the Christian West in the name of the professors; as for instance in Bologna and in Angers. With respect to the licence, another question may be raised (to my knowledge, no one has yet suggested it), to the effect that medieval European universities also developed, in addition to the *licentia docendi*, another licence which qualified its holder to teach in any university of the Christian West, without the necessity of obtaining another licence from that university; this licence was called the *licentia ubique docendi*, a licence to teach anywhere. This type of licence was peculiar to the Christian West because of the notion of 'citizenship' being limited to the inhabitant of a particular city, his own, and which made him a 'foreigner', so to speak, in other cities of Christendom. Islam had no need for such a licence, because a Muslim was a 'citizen' in any city of the Muslim world.

### 5. *Two Definitions for a 'Scholastic' Institution of Learning*

A 'scholastic' institution of learning, whether college, of the Muslim type, or university, may be defined according to its legal status, or as an institution in which the scholastic method is taught. A college of the Muslim type is based on the law of the charitable trust; as for instance the Madrasa Nizamiya of Baghdad whose founder was Prime Minister Nizam alMulk, or the Law School of Irnerius in Bologna whose founder was Countess Matilda of Tuscany. A university is based on the law of incorporation, and acts as a fictitious juristic person; as for instance the University of Bologna or that of Paris. The college, or the university, or one of the London Inns of Court, may also be defined as a 'scholastic' institution of learning; that is, an institution in which the scholastic method is taught, and in which the licence to teach is granted in the name of the guild. *The scholastic method and the licence to teach define the scholastic institution of learning*, be it a university, a college, one of the Inns of Court, or a college-university, the last-named being based on both the law of the charitable trust and the law of incorporation.

## III. LEARNING AND POWER

The licence to teach in classical Islam put into the hands of the jurisconsults of the legal guilds the sole jurisdictional authority to determine orthodoxy. Their position of honour and respect with the common people made them indispensable to the governing powers, the caliph, the sultan, and other men of power and influence, who sought to attract them into their respective entourages for the prestige they afforded, and for their services as mediators with the common people. The jurisconsults thus had sole possession of the 'authority to teach' orthodoxy.

### 1. *A New Power in the Religio-Political Structure of the Christian West*

Transplanted in the Christian West, the licence to teach, the Arabic *ijazat at-tadris*, translated as the *licentia docendi*, and into what was soon to be called the power of the *Studium*, created a new professorial *magisterium*, next to the pastoral *magisterium* of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

The first paragraph of the first chapter of Rashdall's *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, reads as follows:

*Sacerdotium, Imperium, Studium* are brought together by a medieval writer as the three mysterious powers or 'virtues', by whose harmonious co-operation the life and health of Christendom are sustained. This 'Studium' did not to him, any more than the 'Sacerdotium' or the 'Imperium' with which it is associated, represent a mere abstraction. As all priestly power had its visible head and source in the city of the Seven Hills, as all secular authority was ultimately held of the Holy Roman Empire, so could all the streams of knowledge by which the Universal Church was watered and fertilised, be ultimately traced as to their fountainhead to the great universities, especially to the University of Paris.

Rashdall did not take the *Studium* to mean power, in the literal sense, alongside the other two, the *Sacerdotium* and the *Imperium*; he took it to be used in the figurative sense, for he did not see where it could aspire to the kind of power possessed by the other two members of the triad; for him it was simply of sufficient interest to justify the need for a history of medieval universities, for he goes on to say:

The history of an institution which held such a place in the imagination of a medieval scholar is no mere subject of antiquarian curiosity; its origin, its development, its decay, or rather the transition to its modern form, are worthy of the same serious investigation which has been abundantly bestowed upon the Papacy and the Empire.

But the *Studium* was to become, in the thirteenth century, more than an imaginary power. Therefore, to understand the phenomenon of the new professional higher learning of the Middle Ages, both in Islam and in Western Christendom, it should be approached not merely as a movement which created institutions of higher learning, but also and significantly as a power with which the two other powers had to contend. Moreover, the questions asked should cover not only *what* happened, but also *why* it happened.

## 2. *St Thomas Aquinas on the Magisterium*

Rashdall's editors, in the "Additional Note to Chapter I", identify the writer whom Rashdall mentions as "probably Alexander of Roes, in the year 1281". But whereas neither Alexander of Roes, nor Rashdall, nor his learned editors were aware of the significance of the *Studium*'s role, St Thomas Aquinas, a contemporary of Alexander of

Roes, points out two different teaching authorities in the Christian Church: one he called *magisterium cathedrae pontificalis or pastoralis*, the other, *magisterium cathedrae magistralis*. The pontifical or pastoral authority was the traditional authority to teach in Christianity; the other authority, the magisterial or professorial, was something new, an additional authority, next to the primordial one, that of the pope in union with the bishops.

### 3. *Origins of the New Authority: the Studium*

To appreciate the Studium's role in Christianity we must go back to the origins of the scholastic movement in Islam. Islam, unlike Christianity, had no hierarchical ecclesiastical system. Its way of determining orthodoxy was therefore different from that of Christianity. Its orthodoxy was determined through the legal opinions of its religious intellectuals. This was the primordial system practised by the Prophet, considered in Islam as the first jurisconsult, the first 'mufti', and after him, by his Companions and their successors. Any Muslim with knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures could give an opinion, based on this knowledge, to a fellow Muslim seeking it. As we have already seen, the intrusion of non-theistic thought in Islam gave rise to the development of two antagonistic movements, Rationalism and Traditionalism. The system developed by the triumphant Traditionalists was aimed at excluding their adversaries and monopolising the process of determining orthodoxy. To this end, they created the system which has been briefly described: a scholastic edifice the king-post of which was the licence to teach. Without this authority, this doctorate, this so to speak 'teacherate', this 'teaching authority,' no Muslim could hope successfully to participate in the new system of determining orthodoxy, with its professional disputations based on dialectic. With this system Islam had passed from a pastoral teaching authority to a magisterial or professorial teaching authority, in a non-hierarchical system devoid of councils and synods.

The queen of the sciences in the curriculum of the Islamic college was Islamic law, a divine positive law, the methodology of which served as a Traditionalist juridical theology, opposed to the philosophical theology of the Rationalists. Thus scholasticism in Islam was a scholasticism of law as well as of theology. It is this dual aspect of scholasticism which appears in the Christian West: a scholasticism

of law in Bologna, and a scholasticism of theology in Paris—with this difference, that the theology of the University of Paris was philosophical. What philosophical theology had failed to accomplish in Islam, it succeeded in accomplishing in Paris by becoming a legitimate subject of study in the curriculum of the University, by becoming in fact the queen of the sciences in the Faculty of Theology which represented the power of the *Studium*.

#### 4. Charles Thurot on the Power of the Parisian Faculty of Theology

The first modern scholar to point out this power, after St Thomas Aquinas, was Charles Thurot in his doctoral thesis at the University of Paris in 1850, entitled “De l’organisation de l’enseignement dans l’Université de Paris au moyen-âge”, in which he describes this power as follows:

the Faculty of Theology assumed the power of passing final judgement on whether a religious doctrine was true or false, orthodox or heretical. The bishop and in the last resort the Pope could only exercise judicial and coercive power; they simply applied the punishment. Indeed it was necessary to give a theological reason for the condemnation; and this was impossible without having recourse to the science of theology, that is to say, to its *dépositaires*, the doctors of theology. Accordingly, the pope himself could not pass final judgment in matters of dogma. Such was the system upheld by Pierre d’Ailly, in 1387, before Pope Clement VII. According to these principles, the Faculty of Theology had functions analogous to those of the jury in our Assise Courts, and the episcopal and pontifical power was like the tribunal.<sup>9</sup>

Thurot, seeing this situation as a curious anomaly in the Christian world, goes on to explain:

These pretensions were not illusory. Composed of regulars of all the orders and of seculars from all the nations, the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris included, at the time, all that Christendom had as eminent theologians. And in the fourteenth century, the University was, so to speak, the only one. No other university was composed of more members and of more distinguished doctors. All the nations were admitted to the Sorbonne; all the religious orders were represented in Paris by the elite of their Brethren. It looked as though there could not be found anywhere else a more impartial and more enlightened tribunal.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> C. Thurot, *De l’organisation de l’enseignement dans l’université de Paris au Moyen-Age* (Paris 1850) 160.

<sup>10</sup> Idem.

Long before Pierre d'Ailly, Godefroid de Fontaine (d.1306) upheld the right of the doctors of theology not to follow the episcopal decision, but rather to determine, i.e. to provide a solution, in those matters belonging to the jurisdiction of the pope, because "those matters that are established by the pope can be uncertain" (*ea quae condita sunt a papa possunt esse dubia*). Much later still, we can observe at the end of the Middle Ages, the importance that Martin Luther placed on his doctorate when he proposed his theses in Wittenberg as doctor of theology. And finally, in modern times, we are still witnessing the importance placed on the doctorate of theology in Catholic Universities in Europe and the United States.

To sum up: the university is a creation of the scholastic movement. This movement arose in classical Islam. Its members formed themselves into a guild to protect and promote their common interests. To this end they organised themselves into a scholastic guild, and created guild colleges in which they taught a method later called the scholastic method, consisting of three essential elements: the *sic et non*, dialectic, and disputation. The beginnings of the scholastic movement in the Christian West may be seen in Bologna, where the movement's first institution of learning was the college of law founded specifically for Irnerius by Matilda, Countess of Tuscany. The scholastic guild, the scholastic method, the college, and the licence to teach were received in the Christian West, where two other institutions were developed, the university and the college-university, and where the licence to teach eventually developed as a power (true to its origins) participating in the process of determining orthodoxy. This power was first practised by the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris, then by Martin Luther and others who followed him, a phenomenon which has reappeared in our times, in the *ex cathedra* pronouncements of the professors-doctors in university chairs of sacred theology.





## CLOISTERS AND SCHOOLS



## OLD LAW AND NEW-FOUND POWER: HRABANUS MAURUS AND THE OLD TESTAMENT\*

MAYKE DE JONG

In 1980, some twelve centuries after his birth, a conference was devoted to 'Hrabanus Maurus, Teacher, Abbot and Bishop'.<sup>1</sup> Hrabanus certainly fulfilled all three roles. After entering the royal abbey of Fulda as a child oblate in 788, he became the community's most promising scholar. In 819 he was put in charge of Fulda's monastic school, and in 822 he became its abbot.<sup>2</sup> He died in 856 as archbishop of Mainz, an office bestowed upon him in 847. But if we should wish to define him in his own terms, he was above all a biblical scholar. He left a most extensive body of writing, mainly consisting of biblical exegesis.<sup>3</sup> The still extant part of his once formidable collection of letters—on which this article is based—also testifies to this.<sup>4</sup> As teacher, abbot and bishop, he nonetheless

---

\* This article was completed in the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIAS) in Wassenaar, one of the best possible environments for research. I started writing it in the Summer of 1993 in Jerusalem, in the home of Esther Cohen; it is dedicated to her, in celebration of ten years of friendship and scholarly co-operation.

<sup>1</sup> R. Kottje, H. Maurer (eds.), *Hrabanus Maurus. Lehrer, Abt und Bischof* (Wiesbaden 1982).

<sup>2</sup> For the main data of Hrabanus' biography, see R. Kottje, "Hrabanus Maurus", *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters. Verfasserlexikon* 4 (1983) 166-196. There is some controversy about the date of his oblation. Although I disagree on details of his interpretation, I agree with F. Staab that the two gifts made in 788 by his parents Walram and Waltrat to Fulda were indeed connected to Hrabanus' oblation; cf. F. Staab, "Wann würde Hrabanus Maurus Mönch in Fulda? Beobachtungen zur Anteilnahme seiner Familie an den Anfängen seiner Laufbahn", in: Kottje, Maurer (eds.), *Hrabanus* (as in n.1) 65-101.

<sup>3</sup> Most of Hrabanus' work is printed in PL 107-112, which follows the complete edition by Georg Colvener, *Hrabanus Mauri opera omnia in sex tomos distincta, collecta primum industria Iacobi Pamelii. . . nunc vero in lucem emissa curia Antonii de Henin. . . ac studio et opera Georgii Colvenerii*, 3 vols. (Köln 1626-1627).

<sup>4</sup> Hrabanus' letters have been preserved insofar as they served as prefaces to his writings, or as separate treatises. They have been edited by E. Dümmler: *Hrabanus Mauri Epistolae*, MGH Epp. V, 381-516 (henceforth HE). Fulda's collection of letters is lost to us, but it was used by Flacius Illyricus and his collaborators when in 1559-1574 they produced the first comprehensive Lutheran church history; cf. H. Scheible, *Die Entstehung der Magdeburger Zenturien* (Gütersloh 1966). Their

considered scholarship his priority, and often complained of the duties which took him away from what he called the *meditatorium*, the place where he did his reading and writing.<sup>5</sup> He was much in demand, and received requests for new works of exegesis from kings and bishops, abbots and clerics from all parts of the Carolingian Empire. After the division of the Empire in 843, Hrabanus' letters continued to reflect its former unity.

He is also regarded as an expert in law, for he wrote two penitentials and numerous letters of advice on legal matters.<sup>6</sup> Still, this distinction between law on the one hand and the study of Scripture on the other is a modern one. To Hrabanus himself it would have been irrelevant, for his legal expertise was intricately bound up with his biblical scholarship. To him, the ultimate source of all *iudicia* remained the *lex divina*, by which he usually did not mean the whole of Scripture, but the Old Testament. This was the Book of Law *par excellence*, the *lex divina* as opposed to the *lex humana*.<sup>7</sup>

Within the sphere of divine law, the Old Testament held pride of place, for it provided 'law' in the sense of rules and prescriptions, and above all it represented *old* law.<sup>8</sup> Significantly, Hrabanus divided the texts he interpreted into three categories: *lex divina*, *evangelica auctoritas* and *sancti patres*, of which the first carried most weight.<sup>9</sup> There was nothing theoretical about his approach to the

---

quotations from the letter collection have been added by E. Dümmler as an appendix to his edition of Hrabanus' letters: *Epistolarum Fuldensium fragmenta ex octava nona et decima centuriis ecclesiastica historiae*, MGH Epp. V, 517-533.

<sup>5</sup> HE 28.444: . . . *qui gravi aegritudine pressus iam saepius in lectulo accumbo, quam ad scribendum vel ad legendum in meditatorio sedeo*. About his heavy duties as a schoolmaster, he complained in 821-822 (HE 5.389) that it kept him from studying the *patres*: *Horum ergo lectioni intentus, quantum mihi pro innumeris monasticae servitutis retinaculis licuit, et pro nutrimento parvulorum, quod non parvam nobis ingerit molestiam et lectionis facit iniuriam*. . . .

<sup>6</sup> R. Kottje, "Hrabanus und das Recht", in: Kottje, Maurer (eds.), *Hrabanus* (as in n.1) 118-129.

<sup>7</sup> Hrabanus treated the Old Testament first of all as a source of law, e.g. of *iudicia* which could be used as a yardstick when conflicting penitentials failed in this respect (HE 30.450-451). In 822-839 Freulf of Lisieux asked Hrabanus for a commentary on the Pentateuch, *qui scilicet legislatoris libri* (HE 7.392); Hrabanus sent him a commentary on Exodus, explaining why not only the evangelical but also the 'legal' tradition (that is, the Old Testament) should be studied: . . . *ut non solum evangelicis, sed etiam legalibus ad Christi cultum pleniter instruamur traditionibus*. . . (HE 9.395). See also Kottje, *Hrabanus und das Recht* (as in n.6) 123.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. an expression such as: *Unde et in lege veteri per Moysen Dominus mandat dicens*. . . ; HE 42.486.

<sup>9</sup> While writing on incest in 847-856, Hrabanus distinguished between the *lex*

Old Testament as the prime legal source. According to his lights, bishops who had to act daily as judges could only do so if they were familiar with the Book of Judges;<sup>10</sup> similarly kings in particular needed to glean *sacra sapientia* from the Books of Kings and Chronicles.<sup>11</sup>

Hrabanus' life and work show to what an extent learning indeed meant power in the Carolingian age. He gained a virtually unassailable position, not so much as a teacher, abbot or bishop, but as a biblical scholar—that is, not as a 'theologian' in our sense of the word but as an interpreter of the *lex divina* and *historia sacra*. His views on his own society cannot be analysed without reference to the main body of his work, which consisted of biblical exegesis. Here he expressed his thoughts about contemporary issues, however obliquely. Historians have tended to give biblical commentary a wide berth, for the simple reason that they have found it an unfamiliar and often boring source.<sup>12</sup> Those who are dealing with Hrabanus, however, cannot afford to think so. They will have to evaluate him on his own terms, taking his own perception of himself into account, as well as that of his contemporaries. Nonetheless, the most recent collection of articles devoted to him remains almost silent on his biblical

---

*divina*, the *auctoritas evangelica* and the *sancti patres* as the three elements of sacred tradition; HE 53.507.

<sup>10</sup> HE 27.442.

<sup>11</sup> To Louis the German he wrote c.834-838: *Fas enim erat, ut regi christianissimo et in divinis preceptis studiosissimo historia regum Iuda, hoc est confitentium, cum spiritali sensu aliquantulum explanata offerretur* (HE 18.423), sending him a commentary on Chronicles and referring to that on the Books of Kings he had made for Louis the Pious. Elsewhere, he presented Solomon as a model to Louis the German, urging him to study the *sapientia divina* (HE 37.474).

<sup>12</sup> The tide is turning, however. On Carolingian exegesis, see especially P. Riché, "Divina pagina, ratio et auctoritas dans la théologie Carolingienne", in: *Nascita dell'Europa ed Europa Carolingia: un'equazione da verificare*, Settimane di Studio 27 (Spoleto 1981) 719-758; J. Contreni, "Carolingian Biblical Studies", in: Uta-Renate Blumenthal (ed.), *Carolingian Essays: Andrew W. Mellon Lectures in Early Christian Studies* (Washington 1983) 71-98; repr. in: idem, *Carolingian Masters and Manuscripts* (London 1992). On Hrabanus Maurus: B. Blumenkranz, "Raban Maur et Saint Augustin. Compilation ou adaptation? A propos du Latin Biblique", *Revue du Moyen Age Latin* 7 (1951) 97-110; Ph. Le Maitre, "Les méthodes exégétiques de Raban Maur", in: M. Sot (ed.), *Haut Moyen-Age. Culture, éducation et société. Études offertes à Pierre Riché* (Paris 1990) 343-352. A recent example of fruitful use of biblical commentary for historical analysis is Philippe Buc, "David's Adultery with Bathsheba and the Healing Power of the Capetian Kings", *Viator* 24 (1993) 111-120.

scholarship. Virtually every aspect of his life and work is discussed, except for the most central one.<sup>13</sup>

His position as an eminent public figure within the Carolingian Empire was built on this very foundation: he was an expert in sacred law, first and foremost. Throughout the ups and downs of his own career and the vicissitudes of Carolingian politics he remained the *magister orthodoxus*, as Emperor Lothar called him.<sup>14</sup> Those who wrote to him, commissioning new works of exegesis or asking for advice, considered him to be Alcuin's pupil and successor, invested with his master's authority.<sup>15</sup> And so he viewed himself as well. Even as a teenager he went to the court to receive a further education, as the brightest of Fulda's boys.<sup>16</sup> In 801 he was sent to Tours, where Alcuin gave him the nickname of Maurus, after Benedict's own beloved disciple.<sup>17</sup> Hrabanus seems to have been his master's favourite as well.

Like Alcuin he cast himself in the role of adviser of monarchs in all spheres, practical as well as spiritual, and the rulers treated him as such. Whoever doubts that Carolingian court society was deeply literate should realise that it yielded public figures who derived their authority from knowledge *per se*.<sup>18</sup> This was only possible within a court culture which was steeped in texts, and in which kings viewed themselves like Solomon: wise and learned judges, *reges sapientissimi*. This world continued to exist after Charlemagne's death, as is abundantly clear from Hrabanus' correspondence.<sup>19</sup> He made several

<sup>13</sup> See n.1.

<sup>14</sup> In a letter of c.854-855; HE 49.503.

<sup>15</sup> Hincmar, *Ad reclusos et simplices*, W. Gundlach (ed.), *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 10 (1889) 262: *Rhabanum... ab orthodoxo et magno doctore domno Alchuino in sanctae ecclesiae utilitatibus uberibus ipsius catholico lacte nutritum*.

<sup>16</sup> D. Schaller, "Der Junge 'Rabe' am Hof Karls des Grossen (Theodulf Carm. 27)", in: J. Authenrieth, F. Brunhölzl (eds.), *Festschrift Bernhard Bischoff zu seinem 65. Geburtstag dargebracht* (Stuttgart 1971) 123-141.

<sup>17</sup> In HE 43.489 (850, to Hincmar) Hrabanus spoke of *meus magister beatae memoriae Alcuinus*; in HE 14.403 (829, to Hilduinus) he referred to his nick-name Maurus, *quod meus magister beatae memoriae Albinus mihi indidit*.

<sup>18</sup> The argument for the literate nature of Carolingian court culture was first eloquently voiced by R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge 1989), and has been taken further by J. Nelson, "Literacy in Carolingian government", in: R. McKitterick (ed.), *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge 1990) 256-296.

<sup>19</sup> J. Fleckenstein, "Über Hrabanus Maurus. Marginalien zum Verhältnis von Gelehrsamkeit und Tradition im 9. Jahrhundert", in: N. Kamp, J. Wollasch (eds.), *Tradition als historische Kraft. Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters* (Berlin/New York) 204-213.

references to the *lectores* who were part of the retinue of Louis the German and Lothar; they assisted the rulers in correcting the work he sent them. The king acted as the final judge: to him, exegetical writing was sent *ad legendum et ad probandum*, but he was surrounded by *peritissimi lectores* who might find fault as well.<sup>20</sup> These 'readers' seem to have read Hrabanus' work to the king, discussing and criticising it while so doing; this is clear from one of his dedicatory letters to Emperor Lothar, where he wrote:

Order this to be read in your presence, and if you discover something that is not correctly explained because of the weakness of my understanding, or distorted by scribal errors, make your learned readers correct it, and thus you will be rewarded forever with your just reward in Heaven by Christ, the lord of all, for your noble struggle and for having corrected me.<sup>21</sup>

This passage nicely shows which intermediaries intervened between the author of biblical exegesis and its royal recipient: not only scribes but also *lectores* helped to convey the message. In addition, it illuminates a court culture in which rulers had Latin texts read to them by professional readers, pondering and censuring what they heard while the reading session progressed. This also explains why Hrabanus was worried that the *lector* might leave out essential information, such as the names of authoritative authors that he had dutifully marked in the margin; if the *lector* did so, Hrabanus warned, the listener (*auditor*) might get confused.<sup>22</sup> To a large extent, authors such as Hrabanus were dependent on the co-operation and competence of the 'learned readers' who conveyed the written word to its audience. At the court, such readers served as the guardians of orthodoxy, assisting the king, who had his very own responsibility in

---

<sup>20</sup> Hrabanus, HE 34.468 (to Louis the German, c.842-846); see also another letter from this period to the same king (HE 37.472-473): *... et si aliquid indignum emendatione repertum fuerit, cum vestris sagacissimis lectoribus, prout ratio dicat, illud emendare curetis.*

<sup>21</sup> HE 50.505: *Iubete illud coram vobis legi et si quid in eo propter tenuitatem sensus mei non rite prolatum vel scriptorum vitio depravatam conspexeritis, per vestros eruditos lectores facite illud corrigi, et sic vobis merces condigna pro vestro bono certamine et nostra simul correctione a Christo omnium domino perpetualiter recompensabitur in caelis.* Cf. Fleckenstein, *Über Hrabanus Maurus* (as in n.19) 212.

<sup>22</sup> HE 23.429, to Lupus of Ferrières (c.840-841). The letter is a beautiful little treatise on how the *lector* should retain the attention of the *auditor*, and how the lay-out of the book should be geared towards this purpose.



correcting biblical scholarship. Hrabanus considered textual criticism to be Lothar's *bonum certamen*, his 'noble struggle'.<sup>23</sup> The military connotations of this expression must have pleased an emperor who compared himself to that other soldier of God, Joshua.<sup>24</sup> The authority to judge (*probare*) biblical scholarship was one of the hallmarks of a legitimate ninth-century ruler. After the death of Louis the Pious, Hrabanus started sending his commentaries to Lothar, who now was to be the ultimate judge of their 'purity'.<sup>25</sup> The Emperor always travelled with his *bibliotheca historiarum*, which most likely encompassed the historical books of the Old Testament and their commentary, as well as Flavius Josephus and Orosius.<sup>26</sup> Historiography and biblical commentary merged at the level of the 'historical' exegesis of sacred texts, with the Old Testament being the main source of information when it came to interpreting the signs of God's wrath. *Historia*—in the sense of biblical commentary

<sup>23</sup> See n.21.

<sup>24</sup> HE 38.475 (Lothar to Hrabanus, c.842-846): *Alii conferunt ex devotione fidei suae parva vel magna, tu contulisti muneribus tuis nobis maximum librum ducis nobilissimi Iesu Nave, qui tipum veri regi aeterni Iesu Christi preferebat, ut Iesum comitemur arma, nec aliter ad capessendam victoriam valemus accedere, nisi Domino virtutum adheramus*. About Joshua as the *typus Iesu historicus*; see also HE 13.400.

<sup>25</sup> HE 28.444 (Hrabanus to Lothar, 840-842): *Tibi ergo aequo iudicio praesens opus offero, ut tuo examine ad purum probetur, et tua auctoritate contra invidos aemulorum morsus tuatur*. This is about a commentary on Jeremiah which Hrabanus had started to write for Louis the Pious, but now dedicated to his legitimate successor.

<sup>26</sup> HE 49.503 (Lothar to Hrabanus, 854-855): *Siquidem bene novit vestra paternitas omnem nos commentariam copiam, in quibus iuxta gestarum rerum ordinem et expositionem prefate continentur lectiones, in cunctis expeditionibus non posse semper gerere et habere, cum sola historiarum bibliotheca difficile possit etiam haberi plerumque*. In an earlier letter to Hrabanus, dating from 842-846 (HE 38.475), Lothar can be observed completing his *bibliotheca historiarum*, submitting a very specific list of requirements to Hrabanus in order to fill the gaps in his collection. The undisputed centrepiece must have been the *historia regum Iuda* and its commentary (HE 18.423), of which Hrabanus remarked that every Christian king should own one; he commented on the Books of Kings for Louis the Pious while presenting Louis the Pious with a commentary on the Chronicles. It is most likely that Lothar inherited a copy of Hrabanus' work on Kings from his father, in which he drew upon the work of *Josephus Iudaeorum historicus* (HE 18.423). The general concept of *sacra historia* of course abounds in Hrabanus' correspondence, but he also uses the qualification 'historical' in a more specific sense, opposing the *libri hystorici* of the Old Testament to the *libri prophetici* (HE 47.502); see also HE 19.425, where Hrabanus speaks of the *veritas sacrae historiae* of the 'historical' books of the Old Testament. It is hard to say which items of 'profane' history Lothar's travelling library may have contained; I do not believe, however, that the opposition between sacred and profane history makes much sense in this context.

and historiography—was a matter for kings, therefore, for it guided their actions in the present.<sup>27</sup>

Being a prominent royal advisor, Hrabanus of course became implicated in the struggle for power between the sons of Louis the Pious. He had been a staunch ally of the emperor all along, which he expressed by regularly presenting Louis with the fruits of his scholarship, ranging from a commentary on Kings to treatises on filial piety and parental forgiveness.<sup>28</sup> Fulda and its abbot were a bastion of loyalty to Louis the Pious when his sons rebelled, and it is no coincidence that it was Fulda which served as a prison to Archbishop Ebbo of Rheims, the leader and scapegoat of the revolt of 833.<sup>29</sup> Hrabanus adhered to the 'imperial party' after Louis' death, backing Lothar to the hilt. Lothar and his spouse received him amicably in Mainz in 841,<sup>30</sup> and commissioned commentaries on Jeremiah and Ezechiel from him. Hrabanus readily complied, vowing lifelong fidelity to his *excellentissimus imperator*.<sup>31</sup> But from a letter he wrote in 842 it is evident that Lothar's power was waning; Fulda now fell within the sphere of influence of his brother, Louis the German. A worried Hrabanus told his friend Reginbald about an impending visit of King Louis to Fulda, and complained that the busy preparations for the royal *adventus* were keeping him from his writing: 'it is impossible to concentrate deeply on study if the mind itself feels torn in all directions'.<sup>32</sup> His strenuous efforts to give the

---

<sup>27</sup> HE 18.422 (Hrabanus to Louis the German, c.834-838): . . . *quod etiam vestrae nobilitatis in divinis legibus potuisset nostro labore aliquo modo florens exercere ingenium, divinaeque sacrorum librorum testimonio rimando, regni gubernacula secundum patrum precedentium legitime tenenda instruere*. On the uses of *historia* to medieval rulers, see above all K.F. Werner, "Gott, Herrscher und Historiograph. Die Geschichtsschreiber als Interpret des Wirken Gottes in der Welt und Ratgeber der Könige (4. bis 12. Jahrhundert)", in: E.-H. Diehl, H. Seibert and F. Staab (eds.), *Deus qui mutat tempora. Menschen und Institutionen im Wandel des Mittelalters* (Sigmaringen 1987) 1-31; idem, "L'*Historia* et les rois", in: D. Iogna-Prat, J.-C. Picard (eds.), *Religion et culture autour de l'An Mil* (Paris 1990) 135-142.

<sup>28</sup> HE 14.402-403; 15.404-420.

<sup>29</sup> H. Goetting, "Ebo", *Lexikon des Mittelalters* III, 1528.

<sup>30</sup> HE 46.500 (Hrabanus to Empress Ermengarde, 841-851, reminding her of this meeting).

<sup>31</sup> HE 28.442-444 (840-842).

<sup>32</sup> Hrabanus often sounds remarkably like a modern university professor overburdened with administrative duties. HE 30.448-449: *Hludowici enim regis adventus, quod te scire non ambigo, nobis imminens urgebat, ut ad eius susceptionem occupati essemus, nec iam licuit securae lectioni insistere, quando ipse animus sentiebat se in multas partes esse divisum*. There is no certain date for this letter; the fact that Hrabanus went to such

king a lavish reception turned out to be in vain, for in that very year Hrabanus was deposed as abbot of Fulda, after twenty years of devoted service.

He was allowed to remain on the premises of Fulda, however, and, to judge by his correspondence, the five ensuing years out of office were happy and busy ones. Having lived within the confines of Fulda since he was a little boy, his semi-captivity did not bother him in the least. He was housed in the Petersberg, a *cella* of Fulda; finally he had time for study and writing, so much so that he wondered whether he owed his enforced leisure to divine intervention.<sup>33</sup> The fact that Hrabanus was comfortably lodged on the Petersberg after having relinquished his abbacy shows that he was treated with circumspection, whatever his political mistakes. Although he had lost his abbatial power, his authority remained. One of the first treatises he wrote after his fall from power was for his successor Hatto, with whom he obviously remained on friendly terms.<sup>34</sup> And his first royal visitor was Louis the German himself, the king who had deposed him. The two adversaries discussed Scripture, and the king asked Hrabanus for an allegorical exposition of the Old Testament canticles.<sup>35</sup> Actually, King Louis remained one of Hrabanus' best customers; he was the recipient of commentaries on Daniel and the Maccabees, and of a volume of sermons. Some of these works were written at the king's request, others were produced on Hrabanus' own initiative. Undoubtedly Hrabanus used his writing as a diplomatic tool, and he succeeded remarkably well. Kings considered his works of biblical scholarship as *munera*, gifts; like all other gifts, biblical commentary served to cement the bond between giver and recipient.<sup>36</sup>

---

lengths to please the king while still being abbot of Fulda indicates, however, that it was written in 842, shortly after the balance of power shifted in Louis's favour—as it did in the Spring of that year.

<sup>33</sup> Contentedly, he started a letter written in those years with the words *Quadam die dum quietus ab omni mundano negotio in cellulam meam sederem, et lectionem divinarum litterarum operam darem*. . . ; HE 40.478.

<sup>34</sup> A treatise on incest and magic, dated 842; HE 31.455-462.

<sup>35</sup> HE 41.479 (Hrabanus to King Louis, c.844): *Nuper quando ad vos in cellula monasterii nostri, quae vocatur Ratestorph, vocatus veni, et sermo fuit de scripturis sacris, persuadere mihi dignati estis, ut cantica, quae in matutinis laudibus sancta psallit ecclesia, vobis allegorico sensu exponerem*. . . .

<sup>36</sup> HE 38.475 (Lothar to Hrabanus, c.842-846): *Alii conferunt ex devotione fidei suae parva vel magna, tu contulisti muneribus tuis nobis maximum librum ducis nobilissimi Iesu Nave*. . . . On Hrabanus' commentary on Joshua, see HE 13.400-401.

In spite of Hrabanus' new loyalties, Lothar also kept in touch with him, demanding the same kind of *munera* as his brother: commentaries on Genesis, Jeremiah and Ezechiel. Lothar's express demand to have his letter of request included in the preface indicates that there was nothing secret about Hrabanus' dealings with his former lord.<sup>37</sup> The ex-abbot sat like a spider in a web that spanned the former empire, serving as the undisputed source of orthodox wisdom. His deposition in 842 seems to have been a setback that was understood by all as an unavoidable formality.

Hrabanus' learning seems to have kept open all doors to power, even during his five years out of office. His increased productivity even enhanced his position of unassailable authority. Why was he so much in demand as a *magister orthodoxus*? Surely the fact that he was Alcuin's favourite pupil provided him with an impeccable intellectual pedigree. As Hincmar said, Hrabanus had been brought up on milk from the breasts of the Church.<sup>38</sup> It must also have helped that he responded promptly to requests, keeping his clients posted when other activities delayed his progress.<sup>39</sup> Sometimes he lost track of what he had written about, discovering with delight that there were parts of the Old Testament that he had not yet covered.<sup>40</sup> On another occasion he received a request for a commentary that he had already reserved for someone else, and hastened to suggest a suitable alternative.<sup>41</sup> He had a tremendous capacity for work, although some of his letters indicate that he was supported by a team of younger scholars who went over sources for him.<sup>42</sup> He took great pains over the accessibility of his writing, indicating his patristic sources in the margin as well as marking his own comments with the 'M' of Maurus.<sup>43</sup> For Emperor Lothar, who complained

---

<sup>37</sup> HE 38.476: *Duas tibi epistolas misi, quarum una tantum est legenda, haec vero altera et legenda et in libro operis tui anteponenda.*

<sup>38</sup> See n.15.

<sup>39</sup> HE 24.431; 50.505.

<sup>40</sup> HE 33.465-466 (Hrabanus to Louis the German, c.844): *... ad quod tunc respondi, id me iam factum habere in opusculis nostris, quae in tractatu divinorum librorum, quantum potui, confeci, nec modo necesse esse id denuo repetere; sed cum ad monasterium reversus essem et quaesissem, utrum in omnia illa cantica expositionem iam factam haberem, comperi, quod in illa quae prophetae sunt, Esaia videlicet et Abacuc, necdum manum miserim.*

<sup>41</sup> HE 19.424, Hrabanus to Archdeacon Gerolt (829).

<sup>42</sup> HE 23.429: *In quo, quantum mihi licuit et possibilitas sivit, adiuvantibus etiam consortibus lectionis nostrae, ex sanctorum patrum dictis in unum colligi quod illi in diversis opusculis suis, prout opportunitas tractatus postulabat, posuere.*

<sup>43</sup> HE 14.403; 23.449-450.

that he could not drag too many heavy books around on his expeditions, he prepared a handy lectionary in three volumes, to be used for reading at the imperial table around the year.<sup>44</sup>

Bearing this in mind, we can say that the main reason why Hrabanus was called upon time and again was his status as *magister orthodoxus*. Because of his constant reliance on Scripture and the *patres* he has been accused of lack of originality.<sup>45</sup> This accusation is less anachronistic than it may appear, for even in his own time he had detractors who denounced him for never saying anything of his own accord.<sup>46</sup> Their charge was unjustified, for he did insert his own comments, even dutifully marking them with an 'M' in the margin.<sup>47</sup> But the accusation put him in a difficult quandary. On the one hand, he was livid and deeply hurt when he learned that some *scioli* had publicly scorned him for relying too much on the judgement of others. On the other hand, he very consciously projected an image of himself as being no more than an 'imitator and disciple',<sup>48</sup> who followed the *vestigia maiorum*.<sup>49</sup> He viewed *novitates* as the root of all evil, and the 'arrogance of the new' was his main charge against his longstanding adversary Gottschalk.<sup>50</sup>

This did not mean that he never expressed a thought of his own. On the contrary, part of his exposition of the Old Testament is indeed his own work, for the simple reason that patristic commentary on the Old Testament was scanty at best.<sup>51</sup> There were large gaps

<sup>44</sup> HE 49.503 (Lothar to Hrabanus, 854-855). About the lectionary for Emperor Lothar, cf. R. Etaix, "L'homiléaire composé par Raban Maur pour l'empereur Lothaire", *Recherches Augustiniennes* 19 (1984) 211-240.

<sup>45</sup> For an evaluation of past judgments of Hrabanus, see F. Brunhölzl, "Zur geistigen Bedeutung des Hrabanus Maurus", in: Kottje, Maurer (eds.), *Hrabanus* (as in n.1) 1-2.

<sup>46</sup> HE 39.477: *Nec etiam illud silendum arbitror, quod quibusdam narrantibus comperi, quosdam sciolos me in hoc vituperasse, quod excerptionem faciens de sanctorum patrum scriptis, eorum nomina prenotarem, sive quod aliorum sententiis magis innisus essem, quam propria conderem. . . .* In view of Hrabanus' proclivity to call Gottschalk a *sciolus* (HE 42.482), it may have been his old adversary to whom he was referring. This particular letter was written to Emperor Lothar between 842 and 846, at a time when both he and Gottschalk were in Italy.

<sup>47</sup> See n.43.

<sup>48</sup> HE 39.477: *. . . sed quasi imitator et discipulus, non solum ipsius memoratae papae, sed alium sanctorum doctorum vestigia sequendo.*

<sup>49</sup> HE 19.424.

<sup>50</sup> HE 45.499: *Novitas praesumptio mater est hereticae pravitatis. . . .*

<sup>51</sup> Several times Hrabanus referred to the fact that he had inserted comments of his own when patristic commentary was lacking. Cf. HE 34.468 (Hrabanus to

to fill, precisely because there was a demand for law, and the Old Testament could provide it. Bishop Freulf of Lisieux complained of a lack of books in his diocese and asked Hrabanus for a commentary on the Pentateuch, 'that is to say, the books of law'.<sup>52</sup> Hrabanus reciprocated with an exposition on Exodus, agreeing that in matters of the Christian cult the 'legal tradition' was as important as its evangelical counterpart.<sup>53</sup> His answers to queries about incest indicate a similar confidence in the Old Testament as a source for practical legal judgment. No matter what assorted popes or St Isidore himself had said about the forbidden degrees of kinship, Hrabanus considered Leviticus to be the only reliable guide in this respect.<sup>54</sup> His successor Hatto found this rather odd—couldn't Hrabanus come up with some texts from the New Testament?<sup>55</sup> Hrabanus could not, and replied in a characteristic fashion—with a long list of quotations from the New Testament which to his mind endorsed the *lex*, that is to say the Pentateuch. In the process he misquoted St Paul, selecting the one positive sentence about the 'good old law' from a chapter that in fact explains why the *lex* has been superseded (Rom. 7:12-14).<sup>56</sup>

Hrabanus' predilection for the Old Testament as well as his fear of *novitates* stemmed from the fact that he considered Scripture to be law. For him, as for most of his contemporaries, good law was old law, and the Pentateuch was the oldest law known. 'When I write these things, my lord, I do not wish to create new law for you to live by, as you might think', he hastened to warn Bishop Hemmo of Halberstadt.<sup>57</sup> Given his three categories of *lex divina*, *evangelica*

---

Louis the German, 842-846): *Presens autem opusculum nostrum, quod ex beati Hieronimi atque Gregorii, Ambrosii quoque et Augustini, necnon et ceterorum sanctorum patrum tractatibus excerpteram in unum colligerem, in quo etiam, ubi eorum dicta minus repperi, nostra inserueram*. . . ; HE 35.470 (Hrabanus to Louis the German, 842-846): *Praeterito siquidem anno transmissi vobis tractatum in Daniele prophetam, quem non solum ex dictis maiorum, quin et ex nostrae parvilitatis sensu feceram*. For a good assessment of Hrabanus' 'originality', see Le Maitre, *Les méthodes exégétiques* (as in n.12).

<sup>52</sup> HE 7.392: *Maxime autem in Pentateuco, qui scilicet legislatoris libri, humiliter deprecimus*. . . .

<sup>53</sup> HE 8.395: . . . *ut non solum evangelicis, sed etiam legalibus ad Christi cultum pleniter instruiamur traditionibus*.

<sup>54</sup> HE 32.445.

<sup>55</sup> HE 31.455.

<sup>56</sup> HE 31.456: *Unde et apostolus gratiam novi testamenti testificatam asseret a lege et prophetis: 'Quia lex spiritalis est' 'et sancta et iustum et bonum'*.

<sup>57</sup> HE 36.472: *Haec ergo cum scribam, me domine, nolo, ut estimes, me novam legem vivendi tibi constituere, sed olim a sanctis viris prolatam ob recordationem breviter commemorare*.

*auctoritas* and *sancti patres*,<sup>58</sup> it almost seems as if he considered the Gospel as an authoritative tradition which endorsed and enhanced God's law proper, the Old Testament. This is not so strange as it at first appears. Any legal system is per definition conservative and traditional, and this means that law ought to have come down from the distant past if it is to carry weight and authority in the present. This certainly holds true for a so-called traditional society like the one of which Hrabanus was a part. The word 'traditional' does not, however, mean that change is impossible. In oral tradition, the mechanism of structural amnesia will ensure that irrelevant parts of tradition disappear without causing upheaval. This is of course impossible when tradition is fixed in writing, but codification invites change as well: the unavoidable ambiguity and contradictions within a body of texts necessitate interpretation, which in its turn implies modification and transformation. However, such change can only be acceptable in the name of tradition—of that which is old, and therefore good. A legal tradition should clearly link the past and the present, for it is only worthy of its name if it has been handed down through generations.<sup>59</sup> If one takes this legal view of Scripture, as Hrabanus did, his hierarchy of values, in which the Old Testament took precedence over the New, makes sense, as does his insistence that he did not step outside the *vestigia maiorum*. The one thing he did not want to do was to present 'new law', *nova lex*.

This did not mean that Hrabanus had no room in which to manoeuvre, or that he never expressed his own views. He walked a tightrope, loudly proclaiming that he had nothing new to say, yet doing precisely that when nobody was looking. His wish to probe the secrets of the 'old law' certainly made him do some rather original things, such as using the commentary of 'a contemporary Jew, who is quite learned in legal science' in an exposition on the Book of Kings destined for Louis the Pious. Hrabanus said in his dedicatory letter that he did not consider the man an *auctoritas*; the critical reader had to judge for himself.<sup>60</sup> Nonetheless, in court circles this

---

<sup>58</sup> See n.9.

<sup>59</sup> Martin Krygier, "Law as Tradition", *Law and Philosophy* 5 (1986) 237-262.

<sup>60</sup> HE 14.403: *Praeterea Ebrei cuiusdam, modernis temporibus in legis scientia non ignobiliter eruditi, opinionem, quam ille dixit super huius libri capitulis traditionem Ebraeorum habere, non paucis locis simul cum nota nominis eius inserui, non quasi ingerens alicui auctoritatem ipsius, sed simpliciter ponens quod scriptum repperi, eius probationem lectoris iudicio derelinquo.*

learned *Hebraeus* caused some raised eyebrows.<sup>61</sup> The fact that Hrabanus came up with a Jewish spokesman is not surprising, for he was acutely conscious of the Jewish origin of Scripture. When challenging those who denied the validity of witnesses who came from another *gens*, he asked: 'How then have the peoples come to accept the testimony of faith in Christ from the Jews, who were not of their religion and nation? For all the apostles and prophets were Jews.'<sup>62</sup>

Such reminders probably did not go down well at the court; one easily pictures the royal *lectores* frowning when they reached the learned Jew. This enigmatic figure has caused much ink to flow: did he exist or was he a figment of Hrabanus' imagination? Hrabanus was familiar with the so-called *Quaestiones hebraicae in libros Regum et Paralipomenon*, but not all his references to Jewish exegesis seem to have been taken from this source.<sup>63</sup> Could it be that he was in touch with a Jewish scholar who delivered his commentary face-to-face?

---

<sup>61</sup> HE 18.423 (to Louis the German, 834-838): *Ante annos aliquot rogatu Hildoino abbatis in Regum libros secundum sensum catholicorum patrum quattuor commentariorum libros edidi, quos et sacratissimo genitori vestro Hludowico imperatori praesentialiter in nostro monasterio tradidi, in quibus, sicut et in presenti opere feci, Iosephi Iudaeorum historici narrationem, necnon et Hebrei cuiusdam, modernis temporibus in legis scientia florentis, opiniones plerisque in locis interposui, sed non ita, ut quasi lectorem invitum ad ipsorum traditionis adsensum pertraherem, sed magis iudicio ac probationi ipsius illa derelinquens. Ceterum si haec aliquos offenderint, non nostra est culpa, sed forsitan ipsorum perversi iudicii, qui magis volunt aliena opuscula carpere, quam sua condere, qui odio nominis nostri non res, sed personas considerant, magisque aliorum silentium quam nostrum studium probant.*

<sup>62</sup> Hrabanus Maurus, *Liber de oblatione puerorum*, PL 107, 431: *... quomodo gentes natura Iudaeorum testimonium, qui non fuerunt religione et natione sibi consimiles, in fide Christi receperunt? Apostoli enim et prophetae omnes ex Iudaeis fuerunt.*

<sup>63</sup> The question of the identity of the 'learned Jew' remains open. Some consider him to be identical with the author of the *Quaestiones hebraicae in libros Regum et Paralipomenon* (PL 23), which has been edited initially—and mistakenly—as a work of Jerome, but which in fact belongs to a later date; see for example S. Katz, *The Jews in the Visigothic and Frankish Kingdoms of Spain and Gaul* (Cambridge Mass. 1937) 68-70, and H. Schreckenberg, *Die christliche adversus Iudaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jh.)* (Frankfurt am Main/Bern 1982) 507. Blumenkranz has noted, however, that Hrabanus' knowledge of Jewish exegesis far exceeded the *Quaestiones hebraicae*, which he—Hrabanus—rightly considered to be the work of a Jewish scholar rather than of Jerome. Cf. B. Blumenkranz, 'Les auteurs chrétiens latins du Moyen Age sur les Juifs et le Judaïsme III', *Revue des études Juives* 13 (1954) 28-29. As far as I can see, his pertinent comments have not led yet to any in-depth analysis of Hrabanus' use of other possible Jewish sources. I should like to thank those on the internet discussion lists 'Mediev-l' and 'Medtextl' for their helpful bibliographical suggestions, notably Philippe Buc and Anna Sapir Abulafia (via Willis Johnson).



Carolingian court culture was indeed steeped in texts, but oral and written traditions remained intertwined. As a tool with which to analyse Hrabanus' correspondence with contemporary rulers, the opposition between 'orality' and 'literacy' is of no use whatsoever. Kings and great aristocrats were literate in that they could read and understand Latin, but they left the technical side of reading and writing to others. The image of rulers listening to their *lectores sagis-simi* leaps out from the pages of Hrabanus' letters; it speaks for itself, as does Lothar's complaint that he simply could not drag around all the books he needed when travelling. He would not set out without the essential ones, however, and therefore needed a handy lectionary from which his *lectores* could read to him during meals. Surely this royal interest in book-learning was no superficial pose, for the books Lothar thought indispensable underpinned the identity of kingship itself, and the public order of the realm. Lothar recognised himself in Joshua, who was the prefiguration of Christ but at the same time a fierce warrior, as Lothar perceived himself to be.<sup>64</sup> And what was discussed between Hrabanus and Louis the German in Rothesdorf when they talked about Scripture, one wonders? We do not know, but obviously it was of the utmost importance to the king to consult the ex-abbot of Fulda on such matters. Much as he had to punish Hrabanus for having backed his enemy, he could not do without him as a spiritual and legal adviser.

In Hrabanus' scholarship, learning and power thus ran a parallel and mutually reinforcing course. He derived his extraordinary authority from the fact that he was an expert on 'Old Law', which was God's law. His high offices of teacher, abbot or archbishop were secondary to his position as *magister orthodoxus*. In the latter capacity the political turmoils of his age did not affect him, for the powerful of his days needed him to explain the *lex divina* to them. They would have been very disappointed in him had he proclaimed anything new, for what they expected of him was that he should anchor present legal practice in past law. For this reason, the ongoing debate about Hrabanus' supposed lack of originality as a theologian is totally irrelevant. Nonetheless, from his correspondence the contours of a very different group of scholars become clear—the *scioli*, who did value independent thinking and jeered at Hrabanus' refusal to give

---

<sup>64</sup> HE 38.475 (Lothar to Hrabanus, c.842-846). See n.24.

priority to his own exegesis. By the middle of the ninth century, Carolingian literate culture was apparently rich enough to produce a controversial group of scholars enamoured of 'new things'—original and independent interpretations of religious tradition.<sup>65</sup> Gottschalk was by far the most famous representative of this kind of thinking, but he was certainly not alone. The monastic schools produced an atmosphere of burgeoning intellectual curiosity, which remains largely hidden because much of it was expressed in oral discourse. Understandably, the more audacious thinkers preferred to voice their opinions in a learned monastic discussion (*confabulatio*), rather than to entrust them to parchment. The echoes of their malicious comments did not fail to reach Hrabanus, however, who was deeply mortified.

Hrabanus was no astute theologian, but a scholar and interpreter of divine law, who devoted his life to guiding a society in turmoil back to the bedrock of immutable justice. This justice was to be found in biblical law, or rather, in 'things written' (*grammata*)—or so he professed poetically when he was still a schoolmaster, at the start of a long and turbulent scholarly life:

Since the benign Law of God rules the wide world in mastery,  
how holy it is to write out the Law of God!  
This endeavour is a pious one, unequalled in merit  
by any other which men's hands can perform.  
For the fingers rejoice in writing, the eyes in seeing  
and the mind ponders the sense of God's mystical words.  
No work arises which age, full of years, does not  
destroy, or wicked time overturn:  
Only things written escape this fate, repel death,  
Only things written in books renew what has been.  
The finger of God carved things written on rock well fitted for them,  
When he gave his Law to his people.  
These things written show in their record  
Everything that is, has been, or is to come.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> About Benedict of Aniane's misgivings about the *moderni scholastici*, see Riché, *Divina pagina, ratio et auctoritas* (as in n.12) 739-740.

<sup>66</sup> MGH Poet.lat. II, 186:

*Lex pia cumque dei latum dominans regit orbem  
Quam sanctum est legem scribere namque dei!  
Est pius ille labor, merito cui non valet alter  
Aequiparare, manus quem faciet hominis.  
Nam digiti scripto laetantur, lumina visu,  
Mens volvet sensu mystica verba dei.*

---

*Nullum opus exsurgit, quod non annosa vetustas  
Expugnet, quod non vertat iniqua dies:  
Grammata sola carent fato, mortemque repellent,  
Praeterita renovant grammata sola biblis.  
Grammata nempe dei digitus sulcabat in apta  
Rupe, suo legem cum dederet populo,  
Sunt, fuerant, mundo veniant quae forte futura,  
Grammata haec monstrant famine cuncta suo.*

The poem is prefatory to the collection of *tituli* composed between 819 and 821 for churches which Abbot Eigil of Fulda had founded. It is now edited with a translation by P. Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance* (London 1985) 248-249. I have also benefited from the more literal translation by J. Nelson, *Literacy in Carolingian Government* (as in n.18) 266.

## SCIENTIFIC AND SPIRITUAL CULTURE IN HUGH OF ST VICTOR

JAN W.M. VAN ZWIETEN

Among the various forces that made Paris the principal centre of learning in twelfth-century Europe, the culture connected with the abbey of St Victor was one of the most influential. Founded in 1113 with support from the Capetian royal house and the Gregorian reform movement, the abbey became something of an epitome of the flourishing of the city. The attraction it had for the students who flocked to Paris was largely due to the reputation of Hugh of St Victor, who was in charge of the abbey school from the second decade of the century until his death in 1141.

One way of measuring the influence of this school would be by searching the writings of Hugh of St Victor for indications of the sorts of scholarly ambitions he sought to meet. The first work to go to would be his famous didactic treatise, the *Didascalicon*.<sup>1</sup> In the preface, the Victorine master explains that there are two principal ways of acquiring knowledge, namely reading and meditation. He goes on to distinguish two kinds of readers: the first are engaged in the arts or sciences, while the second apply themselves to the Scriptures.<sup>2</sup>

For present purposes I shall merely accept this basic subdivision of Hugh of St Victor's audience and turn to the question of what the student of the arts could expect from his teaching.<sup>3</sup> If we consult

---

<sup>1</sup> Latin edition: C.H. Buttimer, *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon de studio legendi*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin 10 (Washington 1939). English translation: J. Taylor, *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St Victor. A Medieval Guide to the Arts* (New York/London 1961).

<sup>2</sup> *Didascalicon*, *praefatio* (Buttimer 2; Taylor 44). In the following I shall use the terms 'science' and 'scientific' with reference to 'secular' knowledge, the field of the *lectio artium*, which is covered by the first three books of the *Didascalicon*. On the broader significance of science in Hugh and the interaction of *lectio artium* and *lectio divina*, see R. Baron, *Science et sagesse chez Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Paris 1957).

<sup>3</sup> On the teaching of the arts at St Victor, see J. Châtillon, "Les écoles de Chartres et de Saint-Victor", in: *La scuola nell'occidente latino dell'alto medioevo. Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo* 19 (Spoleto 1972) 827: "Les disciplines énumérées par le *Didascalicon* ont sans doute été cultivées et peut-être même enseignées à Saint-Victor".

the *Didascalicon* once again, it appears that the study of the arts served as lofty a purpose as any religious pursuit, namely “the restoration of the divine likeness within man”.<sup>4</sup> While the exposition of the arts in the *Didascalicon* meets this purpose in an original and convincing manner—for which I refer to Jerome Taylor’s excellent introduction to the work<sup>5</sup>—, this exposition does not necessarily reflect Hugh’s teaching practice. In order to obtain a full picture one should also take Hugh’s other works into account. In the following I give some examples from these works, in order to illustrate the various roles in which Hugh cast the arts. The aim of this survey is to see how the Victorine master made his sweeping ideas about the arts work.

Hugh of St Victor left only two treatises on specific arts, namely the *Practica geometriae* and the *De grammatica*.<sup>6</sup> For the historian of science, the *Practica geometriae* is of particular interest for two reasons. On the one hand, it is one of the first works to apply the traditional distinction between theoretical and practical philosophy to a specific discipline.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, it offers a useful recapitulation of medieval geometry just before the influx of Arab science. In the prologue, Hugh himself explains that he did not so much wish to create an original work as to collect the scattered opinions of earlier authors.<sup>8</sup> In his edition of the *Practica geometriae*, Roger Baron implies that the ultimate significance of practical geometry for Hugh consisted in its relation to moral philosophy.<sup>9</sup> This suggestion is not, however, borne out by the contents of the *Practica geometriae*. The work does not include any reference to ethics, but offers a purely scientific description of the three parts of geometry, that is, of altimetry, planimetry, and cosmimetry.

To illustrate Hugh’s method I quote his introduction of the right-angled triangle:

---

<sup>4</sup> See *Didascalicon* 2.1 (Buttimer 23; Taylor 61).

<sup>5</sup> Taylor, *The Didascalicon* (as in n.1) 7-19.

<sup>6</sup> Both works edited in: R. Baron, *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Opera propaedeutica* (Notre Dame 1966).

<sup>7</sup> See G. Beaujouan, “The Transformation of the Quadrivium”, in: R.L. Benson, G. Constable, with C.D. Lanham (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Oxford 1982) 463-464.

<sup>8</sup> *Practica geometriae*, prologus (Baron 15).

<sup>9</sup> Baron, *Opera propaedeutica* (as in n.6) XVI.

The right-angled triangle is composed of three lines, namely the base, the perpendicular, and the hypotenuse. From the consideration and mutual comparison of these lines, every question about the measuring of the plane, height, depth or circle can easily be grasped by anyone who has understood the nature of the relevant formula.<sup>10</sup>

It goes without saying that the last is a reference to Pythagoras' theorem. Hugh concludes his introduction of the right-angled triangle as follows:

Every form in this universe should be adapted to this model. Just as certain mirrors have a way of reflecting small images of great bodies, so we should now, guided by reason, reduce the immense spaces which are beyond man's grasp to this small model and thus somehow subsume them under science.<sup>11</sup>

For Hugh, then, the right-angled triangle is the measure of the universe. To look for anything ulterior in this seems irrelevant. The question raised by this passage is rather of a practical nature, namely whether it implies the use of some geometrical instrument. I am not sufficiently familiar with the history of science to offer any clues on this point. Instead I would contend that Hugh, though first and foremost a theologian, did at the same time take an interest in the arts for their own sake. This appears even in such unexpected places as his spiritual treatise *De arca Noe morali*.<sup>12</sup>

In the third chapter of this work Hugh discusses the shape and dimensions of Noah's ark. One of the disputed questions on this point was whether the ark was large enough to take all the animals and their fodder. The answer found by Origen and adopted by Hugh was that the ark was not measured in normal but in geometrical cubits, which were six times as long.<sup>13</sup> The whole problem invites our author to a geometrical digression,<sup>14</sup> which begins with a conversion of the ark's dimensions to various other measures of length. This is followed by further measurements, which once again give proof of the essential role of trigonometry in geometrical

<sup>10</sup> *Practica geometriae, praenotanda* (Baron 18).

<sup>11</sup> *Ibidem* (Baron 19).

<sup>12</sup> Latin edition: PL 176, 617-680. English translation (partial): A Religious of C.S.M.V., *Hugh of Saint Victor: Selected Spiritual Writings* (London 1962) 45-153. A critical edition by Patrice Sicard is in preparation for the CCCM series.

<sup>13</sup> *De arca Noe morali* 1.3 (PL 176, 628A-B). See Origen, *Homilia in Genesim* 2.2 (SC 7: 86-88).

<sup>14</sup> *De arca Noe morali* 1.3 (PL 176, 628C-629C).

questions. First Hugh calculates the surface area of the ark. On the basis of Pythagoras' theorem he then works out the diagonal of this area to find the length of the angle rafters of the ark's roof. By the same method, he measures the sloping of the roof halfway down the length of the ark. Hugh's digression concludes with a statement which in retrospect seems rather ambiguous:

In these triangles and quadrangles you will find many other things relating to the finer points of geometry. We, however, will drop the whole subject on account of its tediousness.<sup>15</sup>

Notwithstanding the last remark, this digression demonstrates that Hugh could well appreciate matters of a purely scientific interest. It is significant in this respect that the "finer points of geometry" do not return in the continuation of the *De arca Noe*, where they might have been used in the intricate spiritual exegesis of the ark to which the work is devoted.

A good example of this applied role of the arts is found in *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*, an introduction to sacred reading in which Hugh partly recast material from the *Didascalicon*.<sup>16</sup> One of the original parts is a discussion of nine modes of signification in biblical numbers. Of this and other twelfth-century treatises on number symbolism it has been said that the authors felt the need to veil their obvious theological intentions with an air of scientific objectivity.<sup>17</sup> While in Hugh's case the theological perspective is apparent enough, this does not mean that the scientific tradition is completely sacrificed to this aim. Take for instance the first mode of signification, which is based on the ordinal aspect of numbers. The number one, the first in rank, signifies the principle of all things, while the number two, the first to depart from unity, symbolises original sin.<sup>18</sup> This tenet, very common in patristic exegesis, ultimately goes back to Pythagorean arithmology.<sup>19</sup> The scientific soundness of Hugh's treatise on number symbolism is also illustrated by the second mode of signification, which considers whether numbers are

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibidem (PL 176, 629C).

<sup>16</sup> PL 175, 9-28.

<sup>17</sup> H. Lange, *Les données mathématiques des traités du XIIe siècle sur la symbolique des nombres*, Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen Age Grec et Latin 32 (Copenhagen 1979) 11.

<sup>18</sup> *De scripturis* 15 (PL 175, 22B).

<sup>19</sup> See the chapter 'Pythagorean Number Theory', in: V.F. Hopper, *Medieval Number Symbolism* (New York 1969) 33-49.

divisible into equal integers. If they are, they represent 'corruptible and transitory things'; if they are not, but have so to speak a one in the middle, they symbolise that which is imperishable.<sup>20</sup> This exposition is based on the definition of even and odd number in Boethius' *Arithmetica*.<sup>21</sup> As a final illustration of Hugh's arithmotheology I quote his discussion of numbers that represent dimensions. Once again, we find ourselves in the range of Pythagorean lore:

The number ten, which extends lengthwise, signifies the rectitude of faith. One hundred, which spreads breadthwise, signifies the amplitude of charity. One thousand, which rises upward, denotes the altitude of hope.<sup>22</sup>

The mathematical sense of Hugh's exposition is easy enough to see: ten represents the first dimension; one hundred, or ten squared, represents the second dimension; one thousand, or ten cubed, represents the third dimension. The Pythagorean tradition speaks in such cases of linear, plane, and solid numbers.<sup>23</sup>

Hugh of St Victor's treatise on number symbolism, then, maintains a nice balance between scientific authenticity and theological utility. But this balance could quite easily tilt to one side. The subservient role in which the arts were cast in such cases is illustrated by a treatise entitled *De natura ignis et speciebus*.<sup>24</sup> The subject matter of this treatise may be defined as scientific, as the *Didascalicon* ranks the investigation of fire under the science of physics.<sup>25</sup> On the basis of the properties of such fire as is found in a hearth, the treatise distinguishes eleven varieties of this element and offers a moral interpretation for each case. The first kind of fire is found in the sun and in purgatory. This is not kindled from elsewhere, uses no fuel, and does not consume, and therefore constitutes a proper symbol for the divine love. The second kind of fire is that of sheet lightning, which is produced by clouds, but again requires no fuel to burn nor matter to consume. This signifies the presentiments of vice, which, emerging from the heart, find no sustenance in the prudent nor any

---

<sup>20</sup> *De scripturis* 15 (PL 175, 22B).

<sup>21</sup> See Boethius, *De institutione arithmeticae* 1.3, ed. G. Friedlein (Leipzig 1866) 13.

<sup>22</sup> *De scripturis* 15 (PL 175, 22C).

<sup>23</sup> See reference above, n.19.

<sup>24</sup> PL 177, 567-572.

<sup>25</sup> See *Didascalicon* 2.17 (Buttimer 36; Taylor 72).



thing to waste away. The third kind of fire is the light of the eye, which as a natural force is not produced by some external agent, while on the other hand it does use fuel in the scenes on which it feasts, which are however not consumed. This refers to the contemplative vision, which arising from within beholds the wisdom of God, which in itself remains incomprehensible.<sup>26</sup> Along these and similar lines the treatise discusses and interprets a total of eleven kinds of fire, before it concludes with a meditation on the fire of the Holy Spirit and that of the Devil.

Although Hugh of St Victor's treatise on fire is formally as much a combination of scientific and spiritual material as his treatise on numbers, it appears in fact to be wholly inspired by certain moral stereotypes. This conclusion is reinforced by the introduction of the seven capital vices halfway through the treatise, where they mingle with the discussion of the remaining varieties of fire.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, Hugh's distinctions do not really fit in with any scientific tradition. To be sure, some details can be traced to the set texts of the medieval physicist, such as the remark that lightning is caused by colliding clouds, which goes back to Isidore's *Etymologiae*.<sup>28</sup> But the treatise is essentially a moral instruction, in which the eleven varieties of fire serve as a useful didactic vehicle.

So far we have reviewed various functions of the arts in Hugh of St Victor's writings without encountering anything that might be connected with "the restoration of the divine likeness within man". The conclusion seems to be that, apart from such recapitulations as the *Practica geometriae* and the *De grammatica*, the student of the arts had little to expect from Hugh's teaching. At this point I should like to recall, however, that the *Didascalicon* distinguishes two principal ways of acquiring knowledge, namely reading and meditation. It seems to me that Hugh never implied that the lofty objective of the arts could be achieved by reading or study alone. If anywhere, the arts would bear their salutary fruit only in meditation. That Hugh did indeed envisage something like a 'meditation on the arts' is suggested first of all by the inclusion of a chapter on meditation in the arts programme of the *Didascalicon* (3.10). But the clearest proof

---

<sup>26</sup> PL 177, 567B-C, 568B-D.

<sup>27</sup> See PL 177, 569Cff.

<sup>28</sup> PL 177, 568A. See Isidore, *Etymologiae* 13.9, ed. W.M. Lindsay (Oxford 1911).

of this is adduced by his treatise *De tribus diebus invisibilis lucis*.<sup>29</sup>

By way of an introduction to this work, I shall briefly review the chapter on meditation from the *Didascalicon*. Hugh says:

Meditation takes its start from reading but is bound by none of reading's rules or precepts. For it delights to range along open ground, where it fixes its free gaze upon the contemplation of truth, drawing together now these, now those causes of things, or now penetrating into profundities, leaving nothing doubtful, nothing obscure.<sup>30</sup>

Our author distinguishes three kinds of meditation, namely "the consideration of morals, the scrutiny of the commandments, and the investigation of the divine works."<sup>31</sup> It is in this last distinction that meditation touches the range of the arts, since the arts treat of nothing else than the works of creation.<sup>32</sup> In Hugh's words, the objective of such meditation is that "through the things which God has made, a man will learn to seek out and understand him who has made them."<sup>33</sup>

The treatise *De tribus diebus* shows that this understanding is based on the investigation of three aspects of creation, namely its immensity, beauty, and efficiency, which respectively manifest the power, wisdom, and benevolence of the Creator.<sup>34</sup> It is here that Hugh displays his true mastership of the arts. Not bound by the requirements of any set text, he engages in a free meditation on the many wonders of nature. The theme of this meditation is given by a metaphor most often associated with Alan of Lille,<sup>35</sup> namely the 'book of nature'. Hugh declares that

This whole sensible world is like a book written by the finger of God. And the various creatures are like characters not invented by human choice but instituted by divine decree to manifest and indicate the invisible wisdom of God.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Edited in: V. Liccaro, *Ugo di S. Vittore: I tre giorni dell'invisibile luce. L'unione del corpo e dello spirito* (Firenze 1974).

<sup>30</sup> *Didascalicon* 3.10 (Buttimer 59; Taylor 92-93).

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem* (Buttimer 60; Taylor 93). Cf. Hugh's *De meditatione* 1 (SC 155, 44).

<sup>32</sup> See Hugh's *De sacramentis christianae fidei* 1, *prologus* 2 (PL 176: 183C): *Mundanae sive saeculares scripturae materiam habent opera conditionis*.

<sup>33</sup> *Didascalicon* 3.10 (Buttimer 59; Taylor 93).

<sup>34</sup> See *De tribus diebus* 1 (Liccaro 48).

<sup>35</sup> See E.R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern 1948) 323.

<sup>36</sup> *De tribus diebus* 4 (Liccaro 56).

The way in which the Victorine master explains this hermeneutical process is alternately based on the *via negativa* and the *via positiva*. In both cases, the desired result is that the student of creation reaches the point of sheer amazement, where he is susceptible to the understanding of the Creator. The immensity of creation for instance, symbol of the divine power, is seen both in the multitude and magnitude of things.<sup>37</sup> This is properly the subject matter of the mathematical arts, as the *Didascalicon* indicates.<sup>38</sup> But how do these aspects of creation evoke amazement? Hugh exclaims:

Who can comprehend what power was required to create something from nothing! How great, then, should one imagine the power to make so many things? Count the stars in heaven, the sand on the beach, the dust of the earth, the drops in a shower, the feathers of birds, the scales of fish, the hairs of animals, the grass on the fields, the leaves and fruits of trees, and all other innumerable things.<sup>39</sup>

Notwithstanding the rhetorical quality of this appeal with its biblical echoes, one may see here a genuine incitement to scientific research. The amazement that Hugh envisages is not something to be taken for granted, but can only come up and grow through serious study of the book of nature.<sup>40</sup>

For another example I should like to turn to Hugh's reflections on the beauty of creation, symbol of the divine wisdom. One of the manifestations of this beauty is the mutual harmony in which things exist. Hugh says:

This harmony is preserved not just by similar things, but even by the dissimilar and incompatible things which the Creator called into being, and which by the command of his Wisdom entered into a friendship and bond. What could be more incompatible than water and fire? Yet in the nature of things the divine prudence has mixed them in such a way that they not only keep their common bond from breaking, but even supply all that comes into being with the vital force to subsist.<sup>41</sup>

The last statement goes back to one of the classical texts on the arts, namely Macrobius' commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis*.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>37</sup> *De tribus diebus* 1 (Liccaro 48).

<sup>38</sup> See *Didascalicon* 2.6 (Buttimer 29-30; Taylor 67).

<sup>39</sup> *De tribus diebus* 2 (Liccaro 50-52).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *De meditatione* 1 (SC 155, 44): *In primo* [sc. *in meditatione in creaturis*] *admiratione quaestionem general, quaestio investigationem, investigatio inventionem*.

<sup>41</sup> *De tribus diebus* 4 (Liccaro 60-62).

<sup>42</sup> Macrobius, *In somnium Scipionis* 2.10.10-12, ed. F. Eyssenhart (Leipzig 1893) 618-619.

According to the *Didascalicon*, the investigation of fire, water, and the other elements properly belongs to the science of physics.<sup>43</sup> In this case too, then, it is the subject matter of the arts that provides the food for meditation, where it is comprehended as both a symbol and expression of the divine nature.

The sort of meditation Hugh develops is further illustrated by his reflections on the movement of things. This particular manifestation of the beauty of creation is of four kinds, namely locomotive, vegetative, animal, and rational. With regard to locomotion, Hugh refers to the marvels represented by the flow of rivers, the flight of winds, the course of the stars, and the rising and setting of the sun. Vegetative movement is found in the wonders of germination, growth, and decay. Animal movement, which manifests itself in the senses and appetites, causes amazement in that no living creature fails to find what it needs.<sup>44</sup> The greatest marvel, however, is represented by rational movement that is, intellectual activity. Hugh says:

Nothing in creation could offer a better image of God, because the invisible Wisdom appears nowhere clearer than in that which itself has wisdom.<sup>45</sup>

By virtue of this high valuation of human reason, Hugh's meditation on creation now turns convincingly to the *via positiva*. This is where the book of nature is more than a symbol and expression of the divine nature, but an image and likeness. The proof for the existence of God which Hugh finds in rational movement almost takes on the quality of positive science. The first step in this proof is that man recognise his essence to be spiritual, not corporeal. After this he has to see that his existence once had a beginning. Since man is ever aware of his existence, but does not recollect having always existed, it follows that such is indeed the case. Since a spiritual entity can have no material origin, man then understands that he was made from nothing. Finally he perceives that he did not receive his being from nothing, which has no being, nor from something that has its being not from itself, but from the very essence of being, that is, the eternal Creator.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> See reference above, n.25.

<sup>44</sup> *De tribus diebus* 8 (Liccaro 74-76).

<sup>45</sup> *De tribus diebus* 16 (Liccaro 98-100).

<sup>46</sup> *De tribus diebus* 17 (Liccaro 100-104).

In order to find out what the student of the arts could expect from Hugh of St Victor's teaching, I have tried to show that this Parisian master employed the arts in various ways. On the one hand, he included them in his teaching to promote the interests of general education. On the other hand, he used them in their familiar role of "handmaidens of theology", where they were sometimes treated with more, sometimes with less respect. The ultimate objective of the arts, however, which Hugh defines as "the restoration of the divine likeness within man", is not so much achieved in their study as in their meditation. The meditation depicted in the treatise *De tribus diebus* illustrates the fruitful co-operation of scientific and spiritual culture in man's return to God.

## ANDREW OF ST VICTOR (d.1175): SCHOLAR BETWEEN CLOISTER AND SCHOOL\*

F.A. VAN LIERE

In the twelfth century, the boundaries between cloister and school were more fluent than sometimes has been suggested. In this paper I wish to argue in support of this view by examining Andrew of St Victor's position in the school of the abbey of regular canons of St Victor in Paris.

It was Beryl Smalley who first drew attention to Andrew's exceptional position in medieval biblical scholarship. Andrew was a regular canon of St Victor well before 1148. He was abbot of the Victorine abbey at Wigmore, in England, from 1148-1155 and later, from 1162 until his death in 1175.<sup>1</sup> St Victor, founded in 1108 by William of Champeaux (the foundation was confirmed by royal charter in 1113), developed in the twelfth century into a prestigious centre of spiritual learning, with outstanding masters such as Hugh of St Victor (d.1141), Andrew's teacher, and Richard (d.1173).<sup>2</sup> In the environment of the emerging schools at Paris, which eventually would give birth to the University, the school of St Victor sought to bridge the gap that was developing between scientific and spiritual culture, between learning and wisdom, between *sapientia* and *scientia*.<sup>3</sup>

At first sight, Andrew seems to be a rare bird in this context. He wrote commentaries on the Heptateuch, the books of Kings,

---

\* The research reported in this article was supported by grant 301-177-059 from the *Foundation for Literary Research of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research* (NWO). I wish to thank Miss Kate McD. Elliot for her revision of the English text.

<sup>1</sup> B. Smalley, "Andrew of St. Victor, Abbot of Wigmore: A Twelfth-Century Hebraist", *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 10 (1938) 358-373. On the same subject, Rainer Berndt, *André de Saint-Victor († 1175), exégète et théologien*, *Bibliotheca Victorina* 2 (Paris/Turnhout 1991) is indispensable.

<sup>2</sup> F. Bonnard, *Histoire de l'abbaye royale et de l'ordre des chanoines réguliers de Saint-Victor de Paris*, vol.1: *Première période (1113-1500)* (Paris 1904).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. Châtillon, "La culture de l'école de Saint-Victor au 12<sup>e</sup> siècle", in: M. de Gandillac, E. Jeuneau (eds.), *Entretiens sur la renaissance du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris/The Hague 1968) 147-178; R. Berndt, "Victorins", in: M. Viller, F. Cavallera (eds.), *Dictionnaire de spiritualité, ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire* 16 (Paris 1992) 559-562.

Prophets, Wisdom and Ecclesiastes. Most exegetical works in the Middle Ages (and indeed, the works of his fellow Victorines) were above all concerned with the deeper, spiritual meaning of Scripture, but Andrew sought to expound the biblical text only after its simple, literal meaning. Whereas commentators before him were looking for the foreshadowing of the mysteries of Christian faith in the books of the Old Testament, the greater part of Andrew's commentaries on the Biblical text consisted of rendering the difficult Biblical idiom into comprehensible Latin, explicating the meaning of a text by grammatical analysis. Where possible, he related the text to its context and identified historical persons and places. Where the meaning of the text was obscure because of textual corruptions, he made the effort of improving the text by textual criticism. He carefully avoided any allegorical interpretation of the expounded texts, nor do we know of any theological or mystical treatises by his hand.

It would seem that in thus restricting himself to the literal sense of Scripture, Andrew is highly exceptional. The general tone of his prologue to the commentaries on the prophets, quoted by Smalley, seems to suggest that Andrew was aware of his position. He stresses that he is working for himself alone: 'No one is obliged to accept my gift', he remarks, quoting Ovid.<sup>4</sup> Smalley places great value on this exceptional position of Andrew, and suspects that it is a sign of Andrew's great individual rational qualities, his 'humanism', and possibly, of his Englishness.<sup>5</sup> Alternatively, one might argue that Andrew's commentaries are an early sign of the specialisation that the exegesis of the Bible was to assume in the university milieu in the thirteenth century, when theology started to be treated in a systematic way, along the lines of the theological themes of Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*, and when commentaries were no longer theological and mystical expositions on the Biblical text. This method, so the argument goes, left the field of Biblical exegesis open to a more scientific treatment of the Biblical text.

The central question in research on Andrew of St Victor is therefore: why did he restrict himself to the literal sense of Scripture? Was Andrew a scientist, a humanist of the twelfth century? Is he more typical of the attitude of the schools than of the cloister, and was he

---

<sup>4</sup> B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1952) 377.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibidem* 119.

at odds with the striving for mystical knowledge and spiritual wisdom that is considered to be typical of the monastery? Do we have to place Andrew in the schools or in the monastery? I hope to give an answer to these questions by examining the position of Andrew's commentaries in the teaching at St Victor, placing them in the curriculum of its school, and trying to fit them into the spiritual attitude of this monastery.

We know regrettably little about the educational situation at St Victor. The school at St Victor was set up by William of Champeaux as an open school, to provide education not only to the novices of the monastery, but also to students who came from outside. The school for the novices, boys who were of the age to be educated in arts, is documented by the book of liturgy and *consuetudines* of St Victor, the *Liber ordinis*.<sup>6</sup> There is also evidence that at the time that Hugh of St Victor was its *magister scholae*, education was given to a broader circle of students. We know this from the testimony of a certain Laurentius, who describes taking notes on Hugh's lectures for the benefit of his fellow students, and in the evening has them checked by his master before releasing them for general use by all students.<sup>7</sup> We also know that Peter Lombard studied at St Victor as an external student, on the recommendation of Bernard of Clairvaux.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, it is noteworthy that the few descriptions of student life at Paris in the twelfth century, e.g. by John of Salisbury or William of Tyre, never mention any of the teachers at St Victor.<sup>9</sup> This may suggest that the School at St Victor had only a few external students, and that the education was directed in the first place to the benefit of the abbey's own students.

As others have already pointed out,<sup>10</sup> it is difficult to find any

---

<sup>6</sup> L. Jocqué, L. Milis (eds.), *Liber ordinis Sancti Victoris Parisiensis*, CCCM 61 (Turnhout 1984) 96-111.

<sup>7</sup> Bernhard Bisschoff, "Aus der Schule Hugos von St. Viktor", in: *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart 1967) 182-187.

<sup>8</sup> *Magistri Petri Lombardi Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, vol.1.1: *Prolegomena*, Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 4 (Grottaferrata 1971) 15\*.

<sup>9</sup> R.W. Southern, "The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres", in: R.L. Benson, G. Constable (eds.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge Mass. 1992) 133.

<sup>10</sup> Berndt, *André de Saint-Victor* (as in n.1) 30-39.



evidence for the position that Andrew held in the educational environment at St Victor. Smalley's pioneering article on 'The School of Andrew of St Victor' (on Andrew's influence in later exegesis) regrettably does not deal with the concept of 'school' in the sense that interests us here.<sup>11</sup> There is little evidence that Andrew was ever *magister scholae*, although most documents that refer to Andrew do call him *magister*. But this title may well have been merely a polite address, not a reference to his function.<sup>12</sup> The Anglo-Norman chronicle, dealing with the history of Wigmore Abbey, where Andrew became abbot in 1148, calls Andrew 'mestre de divinité'.<sup>13</sup> If he ever exercised the function of *magister scholae*, it must have been during the abbatiolate of Gilduin, after master Hugh died, in 1141, and before Andrew departed to take up his function as an abbot at Wigmore, in 1148. External sources may not give a convincing answer to the question whether Andrew ever was involved in educational activities at St Victor. We must therefore start from the other end, by looking at the style and method of Andrew's commentaries.

For a start, the fact that his comments grow more sparse at the end of the text may be an indication that these commentaries originated in a school: he speeds up at the end of term. Secondly, if we start to read Andrew's commentaries, the oral style of them strongly suggests that they originated from an educational situation. Is it too far-fetched to surmise that the procedure of note-taking, the *raportatio*, described by Laurentius for Hugh's lectures, was common at the school at St Victor, and that Andrew's commentaries were transmitted in this way? The oral style of Andrew's commentaries can best be illustrated by giving some examples.<sup>14</sup> Andrew's oral style is diatribal in character, a feature intended to involve his student actively in his lessons (this includes rhetorical questions):

---

<sup>11</sup> B. Smalley, "The School of Andrew of St. Victor", *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 11 (1939) 145-167.

<sup>12</sup> Southern, *The Schools of Paris* (as in n.9) 135.

<sup>13</sup> J.C. Dickinson, P.T. Picketts, "The Anglo-Norman Chronicle of Wigmore Abbey", *Transactions of the Woolhope Naturalists' Field Club* 39 (1969) 430.

<sup>14</sup> These examples are taken from the commentary on Samuel and Kings, of which I am currently preparing an edition. Other editions of Andrew's commentaries have already appeared, and some are forthcoming, in CCCM 53-53F.

(1 Sm. 21,2) **The king has commanded me.** Without the king's knowledge he fled, yet still he says the king commanded him. Is he not lying? Certainly not. He does not say such things with bad intentions or with the purpose to deceive or to do evil, so he is not lying.<sup>15</sup>

Further, he often employs *anaphora*:

(1 Sm. 2,25) **If one man sins against another.** If one man sins against another, who is of the same nature as himself, by doing him some injustice, there are priests who entreat God for him, there are vows, there are gifts, there are supplications, there is almsgiving, there are moreover many acts of appeasement by which God can be placated.<sup>16</sup>

and a parenthetical style:

(1 Sm. 4,13) **Looking down the road.** He sat, looking down the road that led from the place of the camp, Sylo, watching, that is with his face turned in that direction, not, being blind, to see anything (he was already fully blind) but so that he might hear more easily.<sup>17</sup>

Very frequent also are his explicit instructions for the reader (or, as I should wish to argue, the listener), in the form of stage directions, such as: 'we will deal with this later', and the frequent use of the imperative, e.g. 'take note . . .':

(2 Sm. 1,13) **From where art thou?** He had already said that he was an Amalekite, but as David had paid little attention to what he had heard, because of his grief, he asked where he was from. And take note that when he asks 'from where', he means from which people.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> *Rex precepit michi etc.* Nesciente rege aufugerat et tamen dicit regem precepisse sibi sermonem etc. Nonne mentitur? Minime. Non mala intentione uel animo fallendi uel aliquod damnum inferendi talia loquitur, et ideo non mentitur; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. 14.803, fol. 155v.

<sup>16</sup> *Si peccauerit uir in uirum etc.* Si homo in hominem quamlibet inferendo iniuriam qui eiusdem cuius et ipse nature est peccauerit, sunt sacerdotes qui pro illo Deum deprecantur, sunt uota, sunt munera, sunt sacrificia, sunt abstinentie, sunt supplicationes, sunt elemosine, sunt preterea multe satisfactiones quibus illi Deus potest placari; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. 14.803, fol. 148r.

<sup>17</sup> *Contra uiam spectans.* Contra uiam que de castrorum loco Sylo ducit, sedebat spectans, id est in eam partem uersam habens faciem, non ut cecus aliquid uideret (iam enim penitus cecatus erat), sed ut facilius audiret; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. 14.803, fol. 149v.

<sup>18</sup> *Vnde es tu?* Iam dixerat se Amalechiten esse, sed quia pre dolore his que audierat Dauid parum attenderat, querit unde sit. Et nota quod per unde de qua gente sit querit; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS. lat. 14.803, fol. 156v.

This oral character of his commentaries offers suggestive evidence that the commentaries may have originated as spoken exercises.<sup>19</sup>

Andrew's commentaries may be said to fit smoothly into the programme a student would have followed during his basic education. In the first stages of education, a Paris student would be taught liberal arts.<sup>20</sup> But along with that, the reading of Scripture according to its literal sense was a basic form of teaching, especially at St Victor. It would take place at the school of the monastery, during the time of labour, in the early morning hours. The period of silence that followed left plenty of time to meditate on the deeper meaning of the explained text, and to attain a higher understanding thereof. And as we learn from the preface to Hugh's *De archa Noe morali*, most of the evening hours were spent on learned discussion and lectures, during the *hora locutionis*.<sup>21</sup>

The curriculum and method of learning at the school of St Victor were described by Hugh of St Victor in his *Didascalicon*.<sup>22</sup> Writing in the tradition of Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana*, Hugh depicted in this work the course and method which the beginning monastic pupil had to take to attain learning and wisdom, as well as the spiritual attitude with which he had to study. In the medieval theory of signification, as described by Hugh, words are signs for facts. But these facts themselves, understood in an allegorical way, can be signs for higher facts. We mortals speak with words, in order to denote things; God speaks to us by his deeds, which denote spiritual truth. The foundation of the higher understanding, to be attained through allegory, is the thorough knowledge of the facts of history (*res gestae*). But to understand the facts accurately, we must first examine the words that are signs for them. This is the function of

---

<sup>19</sup> It may be noted on the other hand that the textual tradition of most commentaries is remarkably uniform. This suggests that they were not released for publication before they had attained their final form.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. G. Paré, A. Brunet, P. Tremblay, *La renaissance du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Les écoles et l'enseignement*, Publications de l'institut d'études médiévales d'Ottawa 3 (Paris/Ottawa 1933); P. Delhay, "l'Organisation scolaire au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle", *Traditio* 5 (1947) 211-268.

<sup>21</sup> Hugo de Sancto Victore, *De Archa Noe Morali* (PL 176, 617-618).

<sup>22</sup> C.H. Buttmer (ed.), *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon de studio legendi*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin 10 (Washington 1939). English translation in: J. Taylor (ed.), *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor. A Medieval Guide to the Arts* (New York/London 1961).

literal exegesis: the understanding of words, in order to perceive the facts they denote. Understanding words is the field of grammar. There is nothing surprising, therefore, about Andrew's extensive use of grammar while explaining the Biblical text. After understanding the words, we are prepared for the next step: understanding the facts they denote by knowledge of history and science. Well equipped with a knowledge of the *trivium* (the science of words) and the *quadrivium* and history (both of which comprise the science of things and facts), we can understand the Biblical text, and prepare ourselves for the allegorical interpretation that leads to higher truth.

It was only natural that Andrew should expound the first books of the Bible in their literal sense, since they were more suitable for literal interpretation, as Hugh stated in his *Didascalicon*:

But you ask if I have any opinion about the books which are useful for this study (i.e. the study in History). I think the ones to be studied most are: Genesis, Exodus, Josue, the Book of Judges and that of Kings, and Paralipomenon; of the New Testament, first the four Gospels, then the Acts of the Apostles. These eleven seem to me to have more to do with history than do the others.<sup>23</sup>

Andrew's commentaries on the Prophets and Sapiential books are therefore more exceptional, and this may be why Andrew felt he had to accompany the latter by the earlier-quoted apology for expounding these in the literal sense. Nevertheless, Hugh had allowed even for these to be subject to the Biblical exposition according to the *littera*:

But if we take the meaning of the word more broadly, it is not unfitting that we call by the name 'history' not only the recounting of actual deeds but also the first meaning of any narrative which uses words according to their proper nature. And in this sense of the word, I think that all the books of either Testament, in the order in which they were listed earlier, belong to this study in their literal meaning.<sup>24</sup>

But, as Andrew and Hugh both agree, not all parts have a reasonable meaning in their literal sense: there are many parts of Scripture that are utterly absurd according to their literal sense, says Hugh. In his Prologue to Hosea, Andrew agrees with this view. On explaining

---

<sup>23</sup> *Didasc.* 6.3; Taylor, *The Didascalicon* (as in n.22) 137.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, Taylor, *Didascalicon* (as in n.22) 137-138.

the beginning of this prophet's work, the verses which describe how Hosea was compelled by the divine word to take a prostitute to be his wife, Andrew says:

We can conveniently say that this precept is given to the prophet as an image, for if it really happened, it is vile. We need not believe that certain things, that are prescribed for certain reasons, to serve as a metaphor, really happened. If someone contends that this happened in reality, and not in a figurative way, he will be forced to admit that there are many impossible and likewise unfitting things in holy Scripture.<sup>25</sup>

If Andrew's commentaries formed part of the basic education in the school curriculum of St Victor, is there any sign that Andrew's commentaries may have served as a preparation for further allegory? Again, we can discover only a few hints. Andrew's normal method of exposition is the verse-by-verse commentary, halting at verses of interest, offering explanations where the text seems unclear. But here and there Andrew breaks up the verse-by-verse structure, to deal with one particular text as a whole. We find descriptions in his commentaries according to the *littera* on the tabernacle; on sets of laws and prescriptions in Leviticus; on the temple of Solomon and on difficult pericopes in the Prophets. This method of treating larger parts together at once, instead of one verse at a time, seems to be typical of those parts of the Bible that were more suitable for allegorical explanation. It is my impression that these parts of Andrew's commentaries served as a preparation for an allegorical exposition. Unfortunately, we do not have such an allegorical exposition from the hand of Andrew, as we have from the hand of Richard of St Victor.<sup>26</sup>

It is important always to bear in mind that if we study Andrew's commentaries out of the context of the spiritual attitude of St Victor, we gain a false impression about their 'scientific character'.

---

<sup>25</sup> Possumus (...) non inconuenienter dicere in typo istud prophete preceptum, quoniam si fiat turpissimum est. Neque enim quaecumque ob aliquas causas precipiuntur ut in similitudine fiant, uere facta fuisse credendum est. Si quis uero contenciosus istud in rei ueritate et non in figura factum fuisse contendit, multa impossibilia et eque inconuenientia in Sacra Scriptura cogetur recipere; Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, MS. HB.IV.6, fol. 43r. The interesting question remains whether Andrew sees metaphor as a literary quality of the text (in which case it belongs to the *littera*), or as something beyond it (in which case it belongs to the spiritual sense of Scripture).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Ricardus de Sancto Victore, *Allegoriae tabernaculi foederis*, in contrast with the *Expositio tabernaculi foederis* (PL 196, 191-202 and 211-222).

Andrew's commentaries must be studied against the background of the writings of other Victorines. As we have seen, Andrew's commentaries form a coherent part of the curriculum and method of St Victor as it was described in Hugh's *Didascalicon*. The style of his commentaries strongly suggests that they emerged from an educational situation, and his commentaries contain materials that must be understood against an educational background. Learning was not separated from teaching, and it is likely that Andrew had been teaching at St Victor for some time. Andrew is a teacher. If he states that he is working for himself alone, and says "no one is obliged to accept my gift", I would contend that this is a topos and that we should not believe him.

As Southern has shown, the success and name of a school in the twelfth century depended largely on the person of the teacher.<sup>27</sup> The fame of the school at St Victor spread largely because of such well-known names as William of Champeaux and above all Hugh of St Victor. The spiritual attitude at the monastery of St Victor aimed at striking a balance between spiritual life and learning. This 'harmonious blend' was continued under Andrew and Richard of St Victor, only to decline under the abbatiates of Ernisius. But this was well after Andrew left St Victor to become abbot in a remote abbey on the Welsh marches.

Was there never any tension between monastic and intellectual ideals at St Victor? No doubt there was. Modern scholars might wonder why Andrew ever left his position as a teacher in Paris, one of the greatest centres of intellectual life in the world, to become an abbot in an English backwater. But in the order of St Victor the monastic and the intellectual merged. For Andrew, thorough learning served God as well as the more earthly activities of an abbot.

Andrew's critical attitude proved successful in the intellectual climate of the schools and the emerging university. At the same time, his meticulous scholarship on the literal sense of Scripture formed an important component of the curriculum of the school at St Victor, where thorough learning was seen as a preparation for mystical knowledge and spiritual understanding.

---

<sup>27</sup> Southern, *The Schools of Paris* (as in n.9) 128.



## LEARNING BY EXPERIENCE: TWELFTH-CENTURY MONASTIC IDEAS

I. VAN 'T SPIJKER

Monasteries are known for their cultural and educational function in the earlier middle ages, when monastic schools were among the most important centres of learning. In the twelfth century the cathedral schools, and, eventually, the universities, were taking over this role, and the content and methods of learning changed in the process: this was not unconnected with a development in theology, or what theology was about. Under the influence of the advance of dialectics, theology, which had been an exegetical exercise, became more and more 'dogmatic' during the twelfth century and in this form it became the subject of learning in the universities.<sup>1</sup>

Whatever their role in the study of theology after cathedral schools and universities began to take over, monasteries never ceased to be centres of learning in another sense: as a *schola virtutum*, a school of virtues as Hugh of St Victor says.<sup>2</sup> Of course this had always been so. But it was in the twelfth century, in the time of Hugh, his contemporaries and their successors, that the exegetical mode of theology was more than ever linked with this kind of monastic learning. Such learning, according to Hugh, should not concern itself with verbal contentions but with spiritual wisdom. (Of course, the attitude of monastic theologians like Hugh towards the new learning was much more complicated than these words suggest, and it deserves fuller, independent discussion.) Apart from developments in theology, monastic culture underwent changes, caused by broader developments that had a deep influence. The old benedictine monopoly had been replaced by a far more diverse and varied monastic landscape. Cistercians, traditional Benedictines, Premonstratensians and other canons, all claimed to offer the best way to perfection.

---

<sup>1</sup> See H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'écriture*, 4 vols. (Paris 1959-1962), especially Part II.1, 423, about the consequences of the rupture between speculative theology as well as spirituality on the one hand and exegesis on the other hand.

<sup>2</sup> Hugh of St Victor, *De institutione novitiorum liber* (PL 176, 931B).



Another change concerns recruitment-patterns. The monastic community no longer consisted for the most part of people who had entered the monastery as children/oblates and had been educated far from the outside world. More and more people entered the community after a conversion at a later age.<sup>3</sup> One may think here of Bernard and his companions at the time of their entry to Cîteaux. One of the purposes of the monastic treatises, sermons, institutions and meditations which abound in such large numbers in this period, was to introduce this new population, with its worldly experiences, into the monastic life, to teach them what this life was about, its goal and the way to reach it.

Behind these changes, and this religious enthusiasm, historians have long been stressing deeper developments in the religious sensibility itself: a discovery of the individual, or of the self; a growing interiority; an emphasis on one's own experience.<sup>4</sup> One will remember Anselm's famous call, at the beginning of his *Proslogion*, to enter for a moment the inner chamber of the mind, to seek God.<sup>5</sup> The Delphian adage, to know oneself, was used by Hugh of St Victor in the first chapter of his *Didascalicon*.<sup>6</sup> To consult experience of known things to arrive at the knowledge of unknown things, or to search experience for the limits and defects of one's own cogitations, these recommendations are repeated again and again. Sometimes in this emphasis on experience we can discern a warning against too much reasoning in matters that resist rational explanation. As Richard of St Victor says, regarding the confession of the Glory of God: We learn these things better by experiencing them

---

<sup>3</sup> See H. Grundmann, "Adelsbekehrungen im Hochmittelalter. Conversi und nutriti im Kloster", in: J. Fleckenstein, K. Schmid (eds.), *Adel und Kirche. Gerd Tellenbach zum 65. Geburtstag* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien 1968) 325-345; J. Wollasch, "Parenté noble et monachisme réformateur. Observations sur les 'conversions' et la vie monastique aux XIe et XIIe siècles", *Revue historique* 264 (1980) 3-24.

<sup>4</sup> C. Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual 1050-1200* (1972; Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching, Toronto 1987). For a refined analysis of this concept of discovery as well as for further literature, see C. Walker Bynum, "Did the Twelfth Century discover the Individual?", in: idem, *Jesus as Mother. Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1982) 82-109.

<sup>5</sup> Anselmus, *Proslogion* 1, ed. F.S. Schmitt, *Sancti Anselmi Opera Omnia*, I (Stuttgart-Bad Cansstatt 1968; repr. of Seckau, Rome/Edinburgh 1938-1961) 97.

<sup>6</sup> Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon* 1.1, ed. C.H. Buttmer, *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon de studio legendi*, The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin 10 (Washington 1939) 4.

than by discussing them.<sup>7</sup> But mostly there is no such antagonism between experience and the other cognitive faculties, and experience serves to strengthen the results of these other means to arrive at knowledge, of oneself, of God. The examples could be multiplied to confirm the twelfth-century development towards a more interior religion, after the earlier period where ritual and liturgy were more important. All this is undeniable. But we should not take these words, 'experience', 'interiority', 'individuality', in their twentieth-century sense.<sup>8</sup> On the one hand, the ritual element of course, did not disappear, but could be absorbed into the greater interiority—and the other way round. On the other hand, far from being left to its own psychological devices, leading towards later subjectivity, this religiosity of interiority and experience lent itself no less to processes of stylisation and modelling than the earlier more ritual devotions had done, at least in as far as it was taking place in the monastic environment with its age-old theological, literary and exegetical traditions. In fact, of the four levels of exegesis—history, allegory, tropology and anagogy—it was the tropological or moral level, that was exploited to its limits for these purposes and that came to its full flowering in the monastic writings of this time, just before exegesis was giving way to dogmatics in theology.<sup>9</sup> Besides these exegetical works there were more systematic accounts, like Hugh's own *Institutio novitiorum*. In the Prologue he states the theological and anthropological views that underlie these writings: man's creation after the image of God, and the corruption of this image, but also man's capacity to return to this image, and the ways of doing so. These views determined the goal of monastic life and hence the course that experience was to take. Hugh listed the means to reach the goal: rational investigation of proper behaviour according to different circumstances and places; imitation of examples, meditation, modelling of one's behaviour when speaking and eating. Hugh tried, at least in his *Institutio*, to model the outer man as a means to change the corresponding inner attitudes. Other writers start from the other side—as Hugh does also in other writings—and they concentrate on the inner thought-processes as a point of departure. In

---

<sup>7</sup> Richard of St Victor, *De exterminatione mali et promotione boni* 1.4 (PL 196, 1075D).

<sup>8</sup> See Bynum, *Did the Twelfth Century* (as in n.4).

<sup>9</sup> See de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale* (as in n.1) II, ch. IX, 'Tropologie Mystique'.

both ways the goal is the same: to restore the lost resemblance, to leave the region of unlikeness, to return to the native country. These theological and exegetical traditions influenced the ideas concerning learning what it meant to be a monk.

In what follows I shall explore some aspects of these ideas. Of course there were practical rules in the monastic Rules and Customs. What I am interested in here, however, is these ideas as they are expressed on a literary level, in the many writings that the monks could use for their pious *lectio*. Bernard of Clairvaux, William of St Thierry, Aelred of Rievaulx, Hugh and Richard of St Victor and many others wrote treatises, sermons and meditations for this purpose.

I shall concentrate on one of these writers, Richard of St Victor (d.1173), to see how interiority and experience are structured.<sup>10</sup> As a prior of the abbey of St Victor, with its famous school, he was directly involved in educating the novices. He wrote theoretical, theological works about the Trinity, for instance; but also many exegetical and spiritual works: meditations and sermons. His writings were widely received, not only in Victorine circles, but among Cistercians, Benedictines and others as well.<sup>11</sup> Usually, he takes his point of departure in some biblical text or image and proceeds to explain all its different and possible meanings. Some of these writings are quite systematical, like his *Benjamin Major*, a treatise about the contemplative life and its stages, construed according to the different parts and measurements of the ark of Noah; or *Benjamin Minor*, where the women and children of Jacob each represent different faculties, like imagination and reasoning, or virtues. Other writings are more associative, when a more dramatic biblical text serves as a starting-point. It is important to remember that the monks knew these biblical texts and, if they did not themselves make all the associations, at least they were sufficiently familiar with the material to recognise the stories that the text could evoke.

As reading, monastic *lectio*, was so important, it is worth while to study these works for their structure and their ideas. In what follows I attempt first to show some of their underlying assumptions,

---

<sup>10</sup> On Richard, see J. Châtillon, "Richard de Saint-Victor", in: *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* XIII (Paris 1988) 593-654.

<sup>11</sup> See e.g. J. Ribaillier in his description of manuscripts, in: *Richard de Saint-Victor, Opuscules Théologiques*, Textes philosophiques du Moyen Age XV (Paris 1967) 25-50.

sometimes made explicit; thereafter I concentrate on one text, to illustrate these points in more detail.

In his *Benjamin Major* Richard suggests the right way of reading this text and other writings about contemplation. First Richard presents a short introduction and summary of what the contemplative life is about, for people who have little time, as he declares at the end of the first part.<sup>12</sup> In the following parts, as he announces there, he will explore the contemplative life in more detail, not in haste but slowly, after the manner of the contemplative, according to the nature of contemplation, repeating and explicating things over and over again. More than once Richard appeals to the reader to participate in this process. Elsewhere he refers to the way in which Scripture itself extends the meaning of a word only to restrain it afterwards or to change the meaning altogether,<sup>13</sup> and in effect Richard does the same. These principles thus direct the reader in the way he should proceed. At the same time, they are congruent with an important characteristic of monastic life and of the learning process: the explication, in the literal sense of unfolding, and the restraint reflect the non-linear character of monastic life. There is no question of a straightforward way from beginning to end, but there are progressions and setbacks; it is a way of endless vicissitudes, of hope and despair, the danger of pride being the greater when one is least prepared for it. One is on a staircase, and every moment one has to decide whether to climb or to descend.<sup>14</sup> This implies that every step can be a turning point. The dynamic of the learning process is reflected in the structure of the text as Richard presents it. For example the feelings like love, fear, hope, and sorrow (*amor, timor, spes, dolor*), turn around in circles and change at the sound of a single word, as he says.<sup>15</sup> This circling around is enacted in the repetitions of the text. By reading, ruminating on, and digesting these processes, one is actually taking part in them, imitating them, and in this way, in imitation of the composition which is the text, one is in fact composing the inner person.

The image of forming, or composing, or constructing oneself—or any other image of the artist in the medieval sense, be it literary

---

<sup>12</sup> *Benjamin Major* 1.12 (PL 196, 78D-79A).

<sup>13</sup> *Benjamin Minor* 86 (PL 196, 62AB).

<sup>14</sup> *De eruditione hominis interioris* 1.24 (PL 196, 1271D).

<sup>15</sup> *De statu interioris hominis post lapsum* 1.9 (PL 196, 1122AB).

or musical or architectural—is another characteristic of Richard's ideas. Again and again we come across these images, especially the literary one, about composing the self, images founded on a parallel between text and life. In his treatise about contemplation, the *Benjamin Major*, this process of composing oneself can be identified with an epistemological operation, linked with the architectural image of the building of the Ark: from sensual images to purely intellectual and even superrational contemplation. What is important is the necessity of increasing concentration. The senses offer images to the reason (*ratio*) where they become the object of all kind of cogitations. These wander around purposelessly. When the mind comes upon one of these free-floating thoughts and wants to know more about it, it has to concentrate, and cogitation turns into meditation. Even more concentrated is the contemplation. But from this point of concentration things can be seen in all kinds of ways: the process can now be reversed, an expanded vision is possible.<sup>16</sup>

The ideas of concentration versus expansion, of necessary repetition, and of composition, can be found in most of Richard's works, and not only therein.

In his *De exterminatione mali et promotione boni*,<sup>17</sup> on which I now concentrate, it is not an architectural/epistemological process but another favoured symbol of the inner life, that of a voyage, that governs the text: it is the image used in a Psalm (114:5; Vulgate 113:5): '*What ailed thee O thou sea, that thou fleddest? thou Jordan, that thou wast driven back?*', evoking the exodus of Israel from Egypt, when the waters of the Red Sea were divided to let the Jews pass through; and the entering into the Promised Land under Joshua, when the waters of Jordan were cut off and returned to their source, and where memorials were built (Joshua 3). In three books the stages of the monk's route are connected with these images of transition and reversal—or, to state it differently, the monk's interior is the stage on which the biblical dramas are enacted. Of all the different meanings that Richard attaches to these images, there is space here to indicate only a few.

The first book deals with transition and reversal. First of all the flight of the Red Sea makes possible the transition from Egypt into the desert, that is from the world, the region of unlikeness, into

---

<sup>16</sup> *Benjamin Major* 1.4-5 (PL 196, 67D-70B).

<sup>17</sup> PL 196, 1073-1116.

oneself, into the desert, the place of solitude, the secret places of a conscience that has long been neglected.<sup>18</sup> Next a second transition is necessary, a transition from the self to God.<sup>19</sup> Without this second transition, all earlier transitions are merely in vain, outward change only, taking the habit, making one's profession, but not real conversion.<sup>20</sup> This danger of acting for the sake of appearances only is stressed more than once. The first transition takes only a day, the second transition is a long-term project, and even then we can hardly fulfil it.<sup>21</sup> It implies the experience of failure, and vices, of superfluous cogitations and desires, of self-esteem which threatens to undo what has been achieved so far. These cogitations have to be contained.<sup>22</sup> It is by containing them that the profile of the monk becomes visible, that he will be able to compose the conscience and to reform the mind.<sup>23</sup> Again there is no such thing as a linear, straightforward journey. This composition will always be work in progress:

How often do we have to change, to strike camp, how many temptations do we have to suffer, we have to try every thing, to keep what is good, to abstain from evil. How often do we have to go and to return, to forget those things which are behind, to reach forth unto those things which are before, and [here Richard deviates from his Pauline text (Phil.3:13)] to return again, to take our own experience and to learn our weakness by our own failure. . . .<sup>24</sup>

We are led astray, in dark ambiguities, in monstrous vices, before we can reach the summit of humility, before the Jordan flows back into its source, and the human mind despises itself so much that it passes into God.<sup>25</sup>

Only after having endured all storms, does the Jordan flow into the Dead Sea, dead because now the mind can compose itself into a state of calmness.<sup>26</sup> One has to fix desire on one thing, to concentrate. The necessity of concentration runs through all this, but the

---

<sup>18</sup> *De exterminatione* 1.5 (PL 196, 1076CD).

<sup>19</sup> *De exterminatione* 1.6 (PL 196, 1077AB).

<sup>20</sup> *De exterminatione* 1.11 (PL 196, 1080A).

<sup>21</sup> *De exterminatione* 1.12 (PL 196, 1080BC).

<sup>22</sup> *De exterminatione* 1.14 (PL 196, 1081C-1082B).

<sup>23</sup> *De exterminatione* 1.18 (PL 196, 1086B).

<sup>24</sup> *De exterminatione* 1.13 (PL 196, 1080 CD).

<sup>25</sup> *Ibidem* (PL 196, 1081AB).

<sup>26</sup> *De exterminatione* 1.18 (PL 196, 1085D-1086C).

vicissitudes of hope and despair, the superfluous cogitations are the unavoidable background and the dynamic contrast to this monastic, contemplative death. They will always be part of the scene.

In the second book the reversal of the Jordan to its source is interpreted in another way. It signifies curbing and bending the affections,<sup>27</sup> changing human concupiscence into celestial desires—that is, guiding them into the Promised Land. The priests, holding the Ark, are the first to enter the river, and as soon as they touch the water with their feet, the water recedes.<sup>28</sup> They stand, holding the Ark, letting the people—that is, the affections—pass first. The priests signify investigation, after which the people—that is the affections, that have undergone the necessary redirecting by now—enter the realm where disputing cedes to desire.<sup>29</sup> But even here explorers are sent out: without desire there is no contemplation, without study there is no desire.<sup>30</sup>

The third book deals with the collection of stones and the construction of the twelve memorials, once the promised land has been entered. The miracle of the Jordan flowing back was the work of God, and He guarantees the safety of the place. Besides this place of confidence, however, there is a place of diffidence and desperation, where fortifications have to be made.<sup>31</sup> Richard distinguishes between good and bad stones.<sup>32</sup> Good stones are precious and can be found only in the Jordan. Bad stones can be found anywhere. With the good stones, signifying stability, strength and so on, one builds a memorial in the bad place, to serve in times of despair as a reminder of the state of mind during the divine visitation. The bad stones, symbolising obstinacy, hardness and other negative qualities of stones, are there to prevent any presumption in times of confidence.<sup>33</sup>

Again, Richard plays with his images, by attaching yet another cluster of meanings to these stones. As the stones have been brought together by the twelve tribes of the people of Israel, the progeny of Jacob's sons, each stone now represents the special virtue with

---

<sup>27</sup> *De exterminatione* 2.1 (PL 196, 1087AB).

<sup>28</sup> *De exterminatione* 2.3 (PL 196, 1089D); compare Joshua 3, 15-16.

<sup>29</sup> *De exterminatione* 2.8 (PL 196, 1094D-1095A).

<sup>30</sup> *De exterminatione* 2.11 (PL 196, 1098D).

<sup>31</sup> *De exterminatione* 3.1 (PL 196, 1103BC).

<sup>32</sup> *De exterminatione* 3.2 (PL 196, 1104BC).

<sup>33</sup> *De exterminatione* 3.3-4 (PL 196, 1104D-1105D).

which these sons had been associated in an earlier work, the *Benjamin Minor*.<sup>34</sup> The list comprises fear, compunction, hope, charity, patience, but also speculation, discretion and contemplation. In times of despair one can remember the monument that one has been building in cogitating these virtues.

In a last move Richard accumulates meanings by adding to each stone/tribe/virtue another biblical text and person: e.g. the stone of charity is connected with Peter, on which Christ builds his Church;<sup>35</sup> the stone of speculation is the stone on which Jacob had his dream.<sup>36</sup> The last stone is to be found at Christ's tomb.<sup>37</sup> In this stone, the stone of contemplation, perfect tranquillity reigns. Again, as in the first book, a supreme level of concentration has been reached. Not only does the head lie on this stone, as is the case with the stone of Jacob, but this stone is applied to the whole body—that is, all the senses—and the imagination, the lower cognitive faculties, are absorbed by it.<sup>38</sup> All is a question of passivity, of utter peace. But this happens only after a most violent incident: the one substance of soul and spirit, this most indivisible essence, for all its indivisibility is split, by the living and powerful Word of God, which is sharper than any two-edged sword (Hebr. 4:12).<sup>39</sup> Soul and spirit are separated, and while the former stays behind in peace and tranquillity, only the latter is elevated to the *excessus mentis* and transcends itself, to be united to God.<sup>40</sup> Although this seems to be a point of no return, nothing could be farther from the truth of course. The tranquillity does not last three days (the three days that Christ was in his tomb), nor even half an hour (the half hour of apocalyptic silence after the opening of the seventh seal (Rev. 8:1)).<sup>41</sup> The spirit returns to itself, and resurges to a new life. It is only natural that the contemplative death cannot last. One cannot escape a feeling of anticlimax, of a certain dullness. Everything starts again. What the passible and corruptible mind had left behind, it takes up as if it were

---

<sup>34</sup> *De exterminatione* 3.6 (PL 196, 1106C-1107C). Richard refers to his *Benjamin Minor*, where he treats Jacob's sons in more detail.

<sup>35</sup> *De exterminatione* 3.10 (PL 196, 1108BC).

<sup>36</sup> *De exterminatione* 3.16 (PL 196, 1111B-1112C).

<sup>37</sup> *De exterminatione* 3.18 (PL 196, 1113B).

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem* (PL 196, 1113D-1114A).

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem* (PL 196, 1114BC).

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem* (PL 196, 1115B).

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem* (PL 196, 1115C).



now impassible, incorruptible: that is, it rejoices in tribulation and injustice, it tolerates contumely patiently.<sup>42</sup>

The construction of this monument, then, is the first thing to do in the Promised Land. It serves as a lasting reminder. Whoever forgets about these benefits will never obtain greater goods—so Richard ends this work,<sup>43</sup> indicating once more that there is no end to monastic travelling.

Endless as it may be, Richard guides his readers by his text. Learning by experience, by introspection, turns out to be linked to a literary enterprise, of which this text is only one example. Introspection confronts the monk with the desert, or the abyss of his own heart. A close scrutiny reveals that these deserts and abysses are neither voids nor vacant places; experience is not left to its own devices. Images are turned around to yield all their possible meanings. By exploring these meanings Richard gives an interpretation and a structuring of monastic life. By retracing the composition of the text step by step, by making transitions and reversals, by constructing his own memorial stone by stone, the monk will learn, and compose his own person.

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibidem (PL 196, 1116A).

<sup>43</sup> Ibidem (PL 196, 1116C).

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOMBARDIAN THEOLOGY, 1160-1215

MARCIA L. COLISH

One of the best known facts about the intellectual history of medieval Europe is the success of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* as the systematic theological textbook of choice among scholastics, with its study mandated by the University of Paris during the thirteenth century as a necessary stage for incipient theologians to negotiate *en route* to the coveted doctorate. At the same time, a subject much less well known is how and why the Lombard's *Sentences* attained this commanding position in theological education in the half-century after his death, a period marked by controversies about his teachings and one in which disciples of the Lombard had to share the stage with scholastics whose allegiances lay with other masters or who were simply not interested in the project of speculative systematic theology as such. The question which this paper seeks to answer is thus not so much how a cadre of expressly Lombardian theologians developed between 1160 and 1215—although one certainly did develop—as how Lombardian theology became mainstream Paris theology by 1215. For this was the precondition explaining the university regulations later in the century, the precondition enabling the Lombard's *Sentences* to function as a theological and philosophical training-ground for thinkers of many diverse perspectives. Given the mandated size of this paper, it will not be possible to survey exhaustively the theologians who contributed to this outcome. Rather, what I will do is to take some soundings, using selected thinkers, both Lombardians and non-Lombardians, and using selected issues in the Lombard's *Sentences* as test cases of their use of his work.

I plan to treat four issues, two schematic and two substantive. In deciding which schematic questions to target, my task was relatively easy. For, if one compares the Lombard's *Sentences* with the sentence collections and *summae* of his contemporaries and immediate predecessors, one is struck by the breadth of his coverage and by the coherence of his table of organisation. At the same time, one is struck by his two most salient departures from those principles, departures specific to his schema. The first is the fact that he does

not treat all the points he wants to make on ethics in the same place, despite the redundancy to which this choice leads. Peter treats free will, its role in the psychogenesis of sin, and the vices, in Book 2 of the *Sentences*, under the heading of the fall and the consequences of original sin. He treats the virtues, both theological and cardinal and virtues understood as moral states activated by the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the interaction of grace and free will in the acquisition of virtue, in Book 3, under the heading of Christ's human nature, His human knowledge, psychology, and ethical aptitudes. To be sure, this presentation of vice and virtue leads to a certain asymmetry, in that the human Christ lacks original sin and those consequences of it that affect Him as a moral agent, consequences of original sin under which other human beings labour. Our leading expert on the Lombard's moral theology to date, Philippe Delhaye, has noted that what he has to say on ethics is generally self-consistent, despite his disjunctive arrangement of this material.<sup>1</sup> None the less, this whole area of Lombardian theology is one that seems to call out for streamlining and reorganisation.

The second schematic issue to which I want to call attention is the Lombard's deliberate omission of any reference to the Antichrist in his treatise on last things in Book 4 of the *Sentences*. This decision stems from his wish to repress wild-eyed apocalyptic speculation as inappropriate to systematic theology. It does not reflect his lack of a theology of the Antichrist, since he has one, and it is quite distinctive, in his commentaries on 1 and 2 Thessalonians.<sup>2</sup> Unusual as the omission of the Antichrist from scholastic considerations of last things may be, this topic, along with the placement of ethics where Peter places it, will have its resonance in the sequel.

When it came to choosing two substantive issues in the Lombard's theology as indices of his wide appeal, I invoked a different principle of selection. I ruled out, as too unspecific, consensus positions or poles of debates not resolved in his time which he happens to frame more crisply or to document more appositely than his contemporaries. I also ruled out areas in which he takes a very extreme

---

<sup>1</sup> P. Delhaye, *Pierre Lombard: sa vie, ses oeuvres, sa morale* (Montreal 1961).

<sup>2</sup> Peter Lombard, *In Epistolam I ad Thessalonicenses* argument, 5:1-11; *In Epistolam II ad Thessalonicenses* argument, 2:1-16, PL 192, 287D-290A, 306A-308A, 311A-312C, 317B-321D. On this doctrine, see M.L. Colish, "Peter Lombard as an Exegete of St. Paul", in: M.D. Jordan, K. Emery, Jr. (eds.), *Ad litteram: Authoritative Texts and Their Medieval Readers* (Notre Dame 1992) 80-82.

position or one lacking in future appeal, whether immediate or long range. I settled on two doctrines on which the Lombard places his own stamp, or which he is the first to revive in his own day, doctrines destined to attract the interest of scholastic theologians of all sorts. One is the idea of conscience, the *scintilla rationis* that is not extinguished even in Cain, later to be called *synderesis* by some thinkers. Peter is the first twelfth-century theologian to revive this notion, which he derives from Jerome's commentary on Ezechiel. He brings it up in the context of the consequences of original sin and the mental and moral endowments that fallen humanity retains.<sup>3</sup> The second doctrine, developed as a defence of infant baptism given that God can save whom He wants to save outside of the sacramental order. He lays down for mankind, draws a distinction between two kinds of grace imparted to baptisands. The first is the grace that washes away original sin and its eternal punishment, in rightly disposed adult baptisands; in infants this first mode of grace has objective efficacy notwithstanding the absence of any intentionality in the recipient. The second mode of grace, which adult baptisands can activate immediately, is the operating and co-operating grace with which the moral agent's free will collaborates in developing virtue. Infants, who as yet lack the judgement needed to exercise free will in collaboration with grace, still receive this second grace of baptism, holding it *in munere, non in usu*, as a kind of charismatic trust fund which they can put to use when they reach the age of reason.<sup>4</sup>

Addressing first the schematic indices I have selected, a scan of the scholastics active between 1160 and 1215, largely at Paris, yields only one who confronts squarely the organisation of ethics in the Lombard's *Sentences*, who sees it as a problem, and who offers his own constructive schematic solution to it. He is Peter of Poitiers, definitely a Lombardian, holder of the chair of theology at Notre Dame from 1169 to 1193, and chancellor of the new university from 1193 until his death in 1205. Peter of Poitiers produced a sentence collection in five books. The first three treat the deity, the creation and man, and Christology and the redemption. In Book 4, Peter collects the material on ethics which the Lombard had placed in his own Books 2 and 3 and treats it systematically before proceeding to the

---

<sup>3</sup> Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae* 2. d. 39. c. 3.3, 2 vols., ed. I.C. Brady (Grottaferrata 1971-1981, 3rd rev. ed.) vol.1, 556.

<sup>4</sup> Peter Lombard, *Sent.* 4. d. 4. c. 7.5, vol.2, 262-263.

sacraments and last things in his fifth book.<sup>5</sup> Sensible as this plan may have been, it had no takers, whether among Lombardians or non-Lombardians. As for the Lombardians, such as Bandinus, Gandulph of Bologna, Prepositinus of Cremona, and Stephen Langton, whether they wrote full-scale sentence collections, *Sentence* commentaries, *summae*, or abridgements of the *Sentences*, to a man they stick to the Lombard's schema on ethics, despite its disadvantages.<sup>6</sup> Another Lombardian, Peter Comestor, is known to have written an early gloss on the *Sentences*, the text of which has not survived, so we cannot know whether he adhered to the Lombard's schema on ethics or not. All we can say is that his *Quaestiones*, which have been conflated with those of Odo of Ourscamp by Odo's editor but restored to Comestor by more recent scholarship, and which provide an abridgement of the *Sentences*, show a substantive agreement

---

<sup>5</sup> For Peter of Poitiers's dates and career, see Ph.S. Moore, "Peter of Poitiers", *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 9 (New York 1967) 227-228; idem, *The Works of Peter of Poitiers, Master in Theology and Chancellor of Paris (1193-1205)* (Notre Dame 1936) 1-2, 6. The *Sententiae Petri Pictavensis*, Bks. 1-2, are edited by Ph.S. Moore, M. Dulong and J.N. Garvin (Notre Dame 1950-1961). For Bks. 3-5 consult Peter of Poitiers, *Sententiarum libri quinque* (PL 211). On the classification of scholastics such as Peter of Poitiers, Peter of Capua, Prepositinus of Cremona, and Stephen Langton as Lombardians; Alan of Lille, Odo of Ourscamp, and Simon of Tournai as following other masters; and of theologians such as Peter the Chanter and the Victorine authors of manuals for confessors and sermons as basically pastoral and not speculative in their interests, see J.W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle*, 2 vols. (Princeton 1970) vol.1, 18, 43-44. For the Lombardians, see also M.A. Schmidt, "Das Sentenzenwerk des Petrus Lombardus und sein Aufstieg zum Muster- und Textbuch der theologischen Ausbildung", in: C. Andresen (ed.), *Handbuch der Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte* (Göttingen 1982) vol.1, 607.

<sup>6</sup> Among the abbreviators we may note Bandinus, *Sententiarum libri quatuor* l. d. 28, 3. d. 13, d. 33, PL 192, 1059A, 1077B, 1085D-1086A; Gandulph of Bologna, *Magistri Gandulphi Bononiensis Sententiarum libri quatuor* 1.38, 1.91-162, 1.199-212, 1.228, 3.6, 3.53-54, ed. J. de Walter (Vienna 1924) 28-29, 205-242, 258-263, 275, 280, 309-311. On Gandulph, see Walter, intro. to his ed. lxxxii-lxxxviii, xcvi-xcix; J. de Ghellinck, "Gandulph de Bologne", *DThC* 6, 1142-1150; idem, "Les 'Sententiae' de Gandulph de Bologne ne sont-elles qu'un résumé de elles de Pierre Lombard"? *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie* 11 (1909) 582-599; A.M. Landgraf, "Drei Trabanten Magisters Gandulphus von Bologna", *Collectanea Franciscana* 7 (1937) 357-373. Among Lombardian theologians in their own right, see Prepositinus, Bks. 2-3 of whose *Summa theologica* remain unedited. He reprises the Lombard on sin and the fall, with some addition of Aristotelian faculty psychology, as noted by A. Fries, *Ungerechtigkeit, Fall, und Erbsündenlehre nach Präpositinus von Cremona und Wilhelm von Auxerre* (Freiburg i. Br. 1940) 9-22, 27-39, 41-53, 68; *Der Sentenzkommentar des Kardinals Stephan Langton*, *In 2 Sent.* d. 5. c. 3, d. 24. c. 1, d. 25. c. 1; *In 3 Sent.* d. 3. c. 2, ed. A.M. Landgraf (Münster 1952) 78, 91, 93-95, 108.

with the Lombard's ethical positions.<sup>7</sup> Among the non-Lombardians, we may begin with the same Odo of Ourscamp. Although he studied with the Lombard, he followed his own line, and criticised his master on so many points that he has been characterised as an opponent of the Lombard by Ludwig Hödl. Even so, on many ethical doctrines, he also follows the Lombard.<sup>8</sup> Also under this heading we must place Simon of Tournai, a pupil of Odo's and precentor in his school, whose attachments are more Chartrain and Porretan than Lombardian. Yet, he follows the Lombard's organisation of ethics, both in his *Summa* and in his abbreviation of the *Sentences*.<sup>9</sup> Like Odo, Simon agrees with much of the substance of Lombardian ethics in question-oriented works such as his *Disputationes*.<sup>10</sup> Another non-Lombardian often classed with Simon is Alan of Lille. He, too, follows the Lombard's schema on ethics in his *Summa*, although it is debated whether he influenced Simon or vice versa.<sup>11</sup> And, moving to the early thirteenth century, we find representative scholastic theologians such as Alexander of Hales and William of Auxerre doing the same in their *Sentence* commentaries and *summae*.

<sup>7</sup> The most recent treatment of the literature on Peter Comestor's life and works is J.H. Moore, "Peter Comestor, Biblical Paraphrase, and the Medieval Popular Bible", *Speculum* 68 (1993) 10-11. For the pertinent questions, see Odo of Ourscamp, *Quaestiones magistri Odonis Suessionensis* q. 289, 313, 317-319, 331, 334, ed. J.B. Pitra, in: *Analecta novissima spicilegii solesmensis, altera continuatio* (Paris 1888, repr. Farnsworth, Hants. 1967) vol.2, 99-100, 140, 145-148, 151, 177-180, 187.

<sup>8</sup> Odo, *Quaestiones* (as in n.7) q. 49, 52, vol.2, 48-49, 54-55. See L. Hödl, "Die theologische Auseinandersetzung zwischen Petrus Lombardus und Odo von Ourscamp nach dem Zeugnis der frühen Quästionen- und Glossenliteratur", *Scholastik* 33 (1958) 62-80.

<sup>9</sup> Both are unedited. On the abbreviation, see A.M. Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante*, ed. A.-M. Landry, trans. L.-B. Geiger (Montreal/Paris 1973) 114-115; on the *Summa*, see J. Warichez, introd. to his ed. of *Les Disputationes de Simon de Tournai* (Louvain 1932) xxxiv-xxxv; P. Glorieux, "Simon de Tournai", *DThC* 14.2, 2124-2136.

<sup>10</sup> Simon of Tournai, *Disp.* 26. q. 1, 69. q. 2, 72. q. 2, q. 8.3, 75. q. 1, 78. q. 4, 85. q. 1-2, 100. q. 3, q. 8.6, ed. Warichez 109, 194-195, 204-205, 214-215, 227, 228, 245-246, 289-290, 291-292.

<sup>11</sup> P. Glorieux (ed.), "La Somme 'Quoniam homines' d'Alain de Lille", 2.2.151, *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 20 (1953) 290-292. On the relationship of this work to Simon and to Peter Lombard, see idem, 114-117; O. Lottin, "Alain de Lille, une des sources de Simon de Tournai", *Psychologie et morale aux XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Gembloux 1960) vol.6, 93-106. Alan does not treat Christ's moral psychology in his *Summa* but he reprises the Lombard's position in his *Regulae*, on which see Nikolaus M. Häring (ed.), "Magister Alanus de Insulis Regulae coelestis iuris", 105.1-2, *AHDLMA* 48 (1981) 210.

To be sure, they expand the treatment of ethics in comparison with the Lombard in the light of the philosophical materials available to them. In comparison with the Lombardians of the late twelfth century, they are interested in the substantive teachings of the philosophers and not just their dialectic and semantics.<sup>12</sup>

Turning next to the omission of Antichrist from post-Lombardian treatises on last things, it has to be said that last things attracted far less attention as a subject to be discussed than did ethics in this period. Few masters feel impelled to elaborate a systematic account of it, even when they are commenting on the Lombard's *Sentences*. Of those figures included in this survey who do treat last things, Bandinus, Peter of Poitiers, Prepositinus, and William of Auxerre concur with the Lombard in omitting this topic.<sup>13</sup>

Moving from these schematic issues to the doctrines of conscience and baptismal grace in infants, let us first consider the influence of the Lombard's reappropriation of the idea of conscience, retained by fallen man even in the case of the worst sinners. Despite his own emphasis on the depression of the will as the most onerous consequence of the fall and despite his stress on the need for grace to make free will into a good will in fallen man, if he is to be redeemed, Peter agrees with Jerome that, thanks to the *superior . . . scintilla rationis* that fallen man retains he tends to will the good and to hate evil.<sup>14</sup> Peter of Poitiers seizes and expands on this doctrine, sometimes calling conscience *scintilla rationis* and sometimes *synderesis*.<sup>15</sup> The same

<sup>12</sup> Alexander of Hales, *Glossa in quatuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, In 2 *Sent.* d. 19-45, In 3 *Sent.* d. 13-15, 4 vols., ed. Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi 1951-1957) vol.2, 165-414, vol.3, 127-153; William of Auxerre, *Summa aurea* 2. Tract. 9-25; 3. Tract. 5-7. q. 2, Tract. 10-16, Tract. 18-53, 5 vols., ed. J. Ribailleur (Paris/Grottaferrata 1980-1987) vol.2, 244-713, vol.3, 71-90, 119-313, 368-1041.

<sup>13</sup> Bandinus, *Sent.* 4. d. 38-39, PL 192, 1110D-1111A-B; Peter of Poitiers, *Sent.* 5. 18-22, PL 211, 1264B-1280D; *Praepositini cancellarii de sacramentis et de novissimis* (*Summa theologica pars quarta*), ed. D.E. Pilarczyk (Rome 1964) 115-121; Alexander of Hales, In 4 *Sent.* Tract. 18, vol.5, 458-554.

<sup>14</sup> Peter Lombard, *Sent.* 2. d. 39. c. 3.3, vol.1, 556.

<sup>15</sup> Peter of Poitiers, *Sent.* 2.14, 2.21, ed. Moore et al. 99-100, 170. For a good consideration of the development of this doctrine from the Lombard and Peter of Poitiers through the 1230s, see O. Lottin, "Les premiers linéaments du traité de la synderèse au moyen âge", *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie* 28 (1926) 422-454. T.C. Potts, "Conscience", in: Norman Kretzman et al. (eds.), *Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge 1982) 687-704; idem, *Conscience in Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge 1980) scants the twelfth-century development of this notion, as does G. Verbeke, *The Presence of Stoicism in Medieval Thought* (Washington 1983)

notion is picked up by other Lombardians such as Peter of Capua and Stephen Langton. As with Peter of Poitiers, Stephen sometimes calls it *sinderesis* and sometimes the *superior scintilla rationis*.<sup>16</sup> Although they are often hailed as promoters of a more naturalistic ethics,<sup>17</sup> Alan of Lille and Simon of Tournai do not refer to the concept of conscience at all. But this subject flowed on into the teaching of the early thirteenth-century masters, appearing in the *Sentence* commentary of Alexander of Hales as *scintilla conscientia*<sup>18</sup> and in William of Auxerre's *Summa aurea* as *synderesis*, a moral aptitude he extends to the fallen angels<sup>19</sup> as well as to fallen man.<sup>20</sup> As Odon Lottin has shown, by the first quarter of the thirteenth century, a host of theologians, from Godfrey of Poitiers to Roland of Cremona to Hugh of St. Cher to William of Auvergne had followed suit, irrespective of their personal doctrinal orientations or of the particular interpretations which they give to this theme.<sup>21</sup>

If the non-Lombardians Alan of Lille and Simon of Tournai do not contribute to the transmission and development of the idea of conscience, as resurrected by the Lombard, they do indicate that there were indeed twelfth-century theologians, who, although marching to their own drummers, participated in the development of the doctrine of baptismal grace held latently by infants, along with followers of the Lombard. One lexicographical caveat must be mentioned here before we proceed: thinkers in this period sometimes apply the term *habitus* to the latent baptismal grace of infants. When

---

53-55, who mentions the Lombard's revival of the topic and shifts immediately to thirteenth-century treatments of it.

<sup>16</sup> On Peter of Capua, see Lottin, *Les premiers linéaments* (as in n.15) 429; Stephen Langton, *In 2 Sent.* d. 24. c. 12, ed. Landgraf 93; S. Ebbesen, L.B. Mortensen (eds.), "A Partial Edition of Stephen Langton's *Summa* and *Quaestiones* with Parallels from Andrew Sunensen's *Hexaemeron*", *Cahiers de l'Institut du moyen-âge grec et latin*, Université de Copenhague 49 (1985) 184-186.

<sup>17</sup> P. Delhaye, "La vertu et les vertus dans les oeuvres d'Alain de Lille", *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 6 (1963) 13-25; O. Lottin, "Les premières définitions et classifications des vertus au moyen âge", *Psych. et morale* (as in n.11) vol.3.1, 100-102, 108-109, 114-115, 126-129; C.J. Nederman, "Nature, Ethics, and the Doctrine of 'Habit': Aristotelian Moral Psychology in the Twelfth Century", *Traditio* 45 (1989-1990) 87-110.

<sup>18</sup> Alexander of Hales, *In 2 Sent.* d. 40. c. 1. ad 1, vol.2, 381-385.

<sup>19</sup> William of Auxerre, *Summa aurea* 2. Tract. 3. c. 7. q. 4, vol.2, 76-77.

<sup>20</sup> William of Auxerre, *Summa aurea* 2. Tract. 10. c. 6. q. 1-3, 3. Tract. 16. c. 2, 4. Tract. 5. c. 2. q. 1, vol.2, 301-303, vol.3, 299, vol.5, 75.

<sup>21</sup> Lottin, *Les premiers linéaments* (as in n.15) 436-454; Potts, *Conscience* (as in n.15) Ch. 1.



this is the case, the term clearly does not have either an Aristotelian or a Stoic denotation, even though some of the masters involved do use *habitus* elsewhere in their writings in a more Aristotelian or Stoic sense, to refer, respectively, to a virtue or vice engrained in a moral agent's character through praxis, or to a fixed ethical intentionality toward vice or virtue in the agent's mind. In the case of infants, obviously, neither of these conditions can apply. The Lombard himself draws a distinction between virtue *in habitu* and *in usu* which parallels his distinction between baptismal grace *in munere*, *non in usu* in infants. In both cases his terminology is generic; a *habitus* is something a person has, whether as a gift or as an acquisition, which he has not yet activated.<sup>22</sup> Peter of Poitiers uses the formula *in munere et habitu*, *non in usu*, to describe the gift of baptismal grace in infants; he likewise uses *habitus* in a generic, non-technical sense, comparing it with the knowledge possessed by a mute dialectician who is therefore unable to translate his knowledge into actual teaching.<sup>23</sup> Simon of Tournai also states that baptismal grace is present in infants *in habitu*, *non in usu* in his *Institutiones in sacram paginam*.<sup>24</sup> Alan of Lille says much the same thing in his treatise on the virtues, the vices, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, where he observes that baptism confers grace upon infants *in habitu*, *non in usu*. He repeats the point, using the same vocabulary, in his *Regulae*.<sup>25</sup> Stephen Langton invokes the distinction between baptismal grace *in habitu* and *in usu* in his *Summa*, while reprising the Lombard's *munus* and *usus* language in glossing infant baptism in his *Sentence* commentary.<sup>26</sup> His main contribution to this subject is to treat it in the context of the moral development of children more generally. Stephen also offers an analogy comparable with the mute dialectician of Peter of Poitiers. He contrasts a

---

<sup>22</sup> Peter Lombard, *Sent.* 4. d. 4. c. 7.5, vol.2, 262-263; on his use of the *habitus-usus* distinction, see A. M. Landgraf, "Some Unknown Writings of the Early Scholastic Period", *New Scholasticism* 4 (1930) 17. For a discussion of baptismal grace in the second half of the twelfth century, see Lottin, *Les premiers définitions* (as in n.17) 99-150; Marcia L. Colish, "Habitus Revisited: A Reply to Cary Nederman", *Traditio* 46 (1993) 77-92.

<sup>23</sup> Peter of Poitiers, *Sent.* 5. 6-7, PL 211, 1232D-1233A.

<sup>24</sup> R. Heinzemann (ed.), *Die "Institutiones in sacram paginam" des Simon von Tournai: Einleitung und Quästionverzeichnis* 8.2 (Munich 1967) 82.

<sup>25</sup> O. Lottin (ed.), "Le traité d'Alain de Lille sur les vertus, les vices, et les dons du Saint-Esprit", 1.4, 2.3, *Psych. et morale* (as in n.11) vol.6, 61-63, 80, 84; Häring (ed.), *Magister Alanus de Insulis Regulae* (as in n.11) 38.2-5, 194-195.

<sup>26</sup> Ebbesen, Mortensen (eds.), *A Partial Edition of Stephen Langton's Summa* (as in n.16) 136, 154-169; Stephen Langton, *In 2 Sent.* d. 24. c. 3, ed. Landgraf 92.

harper's knowledge of music, and of his instrument, with the actual chords that he may decide to strike.<sup>27</sup> Prepositinus agrees that baptised infants receive grace *in habitu, non in usu*.<sup>28</sup> Peter the Chanter also aligns himself with the Lombard on this issue, although, as a thinker who stresses pastoral theology, he lacks the systematic concerns of the Lombardians. But, despite the fact that he has been regarded as an unphilosophical and unspeculative theologian, he is more successful than are Alan and Simon in imparting a strict Aristotelian sense to his vocabulary in this context, even though Alan and Simon generally get higher philosophical marks than he does. Since he understands *habitus* in Aristotelian terms, the Chanter, appropriately enough, rules it out in infants. At the same time, he preserves the essence of the Lombard's baptismal doctrine by substituting *habilitas* for *habitus* or *munus*, as distinct from *usus*.<sup>29</sup> The early thirteenth-century scholastics continue to use similar language to define latent baptismal grace in infants. Like the Chanter, they give an Aristotelian gloss to the point, understanding it in terms of potency and act. Thus, for Alexander of Hales, this grace dwells in infants *in habitu potens, non operans*.<sup>30</sup> And William of Auxerre expresses the same Aristotelian scruples concerning *habitus* in this connection as we have seen in the Chanter. He agrees that infants can have neither the *habitus* nor the *usus* of virtue, since these moral states require a conscious knowledge and volition which they currently lack. His solution, which retains the main lines of the Lombard's position even as he tips his hat to Aristotle, is to say that the grace infused in infants by baptism enables them to have virtue *sed in habitu implicito et remoto ab actu*. These charisms may be translated into explicit and actualised virtue, by the child's conscious choice, in the future.<sup>31</sup> Tying this theme together with that of conscience, William adds that the same latent grace of baptism will later be capable of activating the child's *synderesis*.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Stephen Langton, *Summa*, Ebbesen, Mortensen (eds.), *A Partial Edition of Stephen Langton's Summa* (as in n.16) 144.

<sup>28</sup> Prepositinus, *Summa* 4, ed. Pilarczyk 38, 44.

<sup>29</sup> Peter the Chanter, *Summa de sacramentis et animae consiliis* 24, 58, ed. J.-A. Dugauquier (Louvain 1954-1967) vol.3.2B, 520-522.

<sup>30</sup> Alexander of Hales, *In 4 Sent.* d. 4. c. 19, vol.4, 88.

<sup>31</sup> William of Auxerre, *Summa aurea* 4. Tract. 5. c. 4. q. 3, vol.5, 114-116; the quotation is on 115.

<sup>32</sup> William of Auxerre, *Summa aurea* 4. Tract. 5. c. 2. q. 1, vol.5, 75.

On the two substantive points considered, and on a host of others which we might have examined, we can see the preservation and elaboration of doctrines that are specifically Lombardian by his successors, whether they are disciples in the strict sense or not, whether they are animated by the same kinds of theological concerns or not, and irrespective of the kinds of choices and applications they make of the philosophical sources available in their day. The same may be said of the two schematic issues peculiar to the Lombard which we have also considered. As it develops into mainstream Paris theology by 1215, Lombardian theology manifests three of the features noted by Artur Michael Landgraf in defining what identifies a school of thought as such: a common teaching maintained over a considerable period of time, organic development within that teaching, and an extensive manuscript tradition of the school's founder coupled with strong evidence of oral instruction along with the written texts. Landgraf agrees that the Lombardian tradition possessed these features and that it was capable of becoming the common property of scholastic theologians who manifested the most diverse tendencies of the age. But, in Landgraf's estimation, such was the case because Peter Lombard rarely expressed any personal opinions.<sup>33</sup> This last point is clearly incorrect. For, as this paper has sought to show, it was precisely in areas where the Lombard does express a personal opinion, or even an idiosyncratic decision about what to include in his *Sentences* and where to place it, that the long reach of his work can best be charted. In thinking about the formative role of Peter Lombard in the education of professional theologians in the high Middle Ages, then, we need to go beyond the circle of his most faithful and immediate followers to embrace the masters of all theological and philosophical persuasions who found in him a schoolmaster stimulating and flexible enough to spark their own speculation and to accommodate their own ideas and agendas. Peter Lombard's capacity to do just that was clearly acknowledged by the first quarter of the thirteenth century, from which vantage point his *Sentences* continued to exercise their commanding influence on the schoolmen across the remaining medieval centuries.

---

<sup>33</sup> Landgraf, *Introduction* (as in n.9) 26-27.

# ACADEMIC HERESY AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS, 1200-1378

J.M.M.H. THIJSSEN

The phenomenon of academic heresy, i.e. of an allegedly erroneous opinion disseminated in teaching or writing by a university-trained scholar and formally condemned by an accepted ecclesiastical authority, has long fascinated historians of medieval thought. Almost all records that concern condemnations of false teaching at the University of Paris are published in the *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* by Heinrich Denifle and Emile Chatelain, a four-volume edition of documents that have a bearing upon the University, its masters and students, and its officers.<sup>1</sup> Many of these documents were derived from an older collection of doctrinal pronouncements and censures, namely the *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus* by Charles du Plessis d'Argentré (1673-1740), doctor in theology of the University of Paris, almoner to King Louis XV, and Bishop of Tulle.<sup>2</sup>

The condemnations of erroneous teaching by masters or bachelors at the University of Paris raise many questions. So far, the emphasis in the scholarly literature has been on doctrinal aspects, i.e. on the content and context of the prohibited views. But there are other approaches that can tell us much about the role and meaning of these cases.<sup>3</sup> This paper does no more than offer a few observations on the following three aspects of the phenomenon of academic

---

<sup>1</sup> H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 4 vols. (Paris 1889-1891).

<sup>2</sup> C. Du Plessis d'Argentré, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus*, 3 vols. (Paris 1724-1736). The collection covers the period from 1100 until 1713.

<sup>3</sup> See for instance J. Koch, *Kleine Schriften*, 2 vols. (Rome 1973); J. Miethke, "Papst, Ortsbischof und Universität in den Pariser Theologenprozessen des 13. Jahrhunderts", in: A. Zimmermann (ed.), *Die Auseinandersetzungen an der Pariser Universität im XIII. Jahrhundert* (Berlin 1976) 52-95; W.J. Courtenay, "Inquiry and Inquisition: Academic Freedom in Medieval Universities", *Church History* 58 (1989) 168-182, and J.M.M.H. Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy at the University of Paris, 1200-1378* (forthcoming, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press), where a select bibliography of the subject is given.

heresy: first, the employment of the notion of heresy in dealing with allegedly erring academics; secondly, the judicial procedures against erring academics; and finally, the adequacy of the modern concept of "academic freedom" in interpreting medieval academic condemnations.<sup>4</sup>

The evidence is provided by the thirty or so documented cases of academic heresy at the University of Paris (including those that were handled within the religious orders) that took place between 1200 and 1378.<sup>5</sup> The first date marks the beginning of the *universitas* of scholars at Paris, the emergence of a community of academics in the real sense of the word. The study has as its end-point the Great Schism. By 1380, Christendom was faced with two distinct papacies, one at Rome (Urban VI), and one at Avignon (Clement VII). The ensuing crisis in ecclesiastical authority considerably affected the relationship between the University of Paris and the papacy, and also left its mark on the way in which orthodoxy of teaching was monitored. With a few exceptions, all cases of academic condemnations between 1200 and 1378 concerned masters or bachelors of theology.

### 1. THE NOTION OF HERESY

The cry of heresy was the customary way to start procedures against erring academics. Nevertheless, academic condemnations have hardly been studied from an heresiological angle. Many a survey of medieval heresy will immediately in its Preface exclude the treatment of academic heresies, with the exception perhaps of those of John Wycliff and Jan Hus, who gave a direct impetus to a *popular* heresy. It seems as if academic heresies constitute an anomaly within the mainstream of medieval popular heresies.

The scholar who has probably most strongly expressed this view was Henry Charles Lea. In his classic *History of the Inquisition in the*

---

<sup>4</sup> These and other aspects of academic heresy, such as the agent of authority in monitoring and judging orthodoxy among academics at the University of Paris (or in other words, the roles of the local bishop, the chancellor, the masters, and the pope), and the preservation and circulation of lists of condemned views in the academic community at Paris are more fully explored in Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy* (as in n.3).

<sup>5</sup> A full guide to the published sources of all documented cases of academic heresy at the University of Paris (and of some others as well) is given in Thijssen, *Censure and Heresy* (as in n.3).

*Middle Ages*, Lea maintained that 'real' heresy sprang from the heart, whereas academic heresy sprang from the brain. In Lea's view it was the peasant, rather than the master, who was inspired sufficiently to approach the stake singing hymns.<sup>6</sup> A more plausible explanation of the absence of academic heresies in surveys of medieval heresy may lie in the fact that they are considered too academic, in the double sense of the word, to be of any relevance to the dynamic of religious dissent. First, academic heresy only seems to concern a few isolated scholars at a university, and secondly, the doctrinal issues were very academic, i.e. they concerned fine points of scholastic theology and philosophy. In brief, academic heresies really seem to belong in a separate category.

And yet, academic condemnations deserve to be studied from an heresiological perspective as well. By labelling several ideas disseminated within a university context as heretical, medieval ecclesiastical authorities—either on purpose, or by lack of any other terminology—put *academic* heresies on a par with *popular* heresies. As a consequence, the structures of authority in monitoring and judging the orthodoxy of the academic community—the “technology of power”, to borrow a felicitous phrase of James Given—were not so different from those with which the ecclesiastical hierarchy tried to curb *popular* heresies.<sup>7</sup>

Academics could either openly or implicitly be accused of disseminating heretical opinions. Theoretically, “heresy” is the polar opposite of “orthodoxy”. As a matter of fact, however, the concepts “heresy” and “orthodoxy” are fluid: application of the notion of heresy implies a standard or norm, a definition of what is orthodox doctrine. In other words, as Jeffrey Russell has pointed out, “orthodoxy defines heresy, and heresy helps define orthodoxy.”<sup>8</sup> In addition, however, the term “heretic” was often used in a broader sense to discredit dissenting academics who had not yet been formally condemned. In many cases of academic heresy an assertion of orthodoxy was still lacking. By turning dissent into heresy, ecclesiastical

---

<sup>6</sup> H.C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (London 1922); the first edition appeared in 1887. Pages 550-616 are devoted to academic heresies.

<sup>7</sup> J. Given, “The Inquisitors of Languedoc and the Medieval Technology of Power”, *The American Historical Review* 94 (1989) 336-360, 341-342.

<sup>8</sup> J.B. Russell, *Dissent and Order in the Middle Ages. The Search for Legitimate Authority* (New York 1992) 4.

authorities were able to deal with academics who somehow did not conform at the time to the *communis opinio* in theology.

But what was heresy?<sup>9</sup> Some medieval writers, relying on the Biblical picture of the foxes which showed many faces, but whose tails were bound together into one (Judges 15, 4-5), presented heresy as one single movement, which changed its form and appearance in time and place, but whose essence remained unchanged. Others used other images. As a matter of fact, there was not one coherent concept of heresy during the Middle Ages. Behind the vocabulary of the medieval documents one perceives many different, not always consistent concepts of heresy. A convenient definition is provided by Robert Grosseteste (c.1170-1253), as reported by the chronicler Matthew of Paris: "heresy is an opinion chosen by human reason contrary to holy Scripture, publicly avowed and obstinately defended."<sup>10</sup>

In particular the aspect of obstinacy or pertinacity had an important practical bearing on the whole matter of heresy. In the first place, the idea of pertinacity was used to set apart the heretic from the innocent blunderer who committed his errors not out of any obstinacy, but out of theological ignorance. Secondly, and more importantly with respect to academic heresies, the notion of pertinacity played a crucial role in the judicial procedures against alleged heretics. It was one thing to establish whether certain opinions were heretical, but quite another thing to condemn the *holder* of these opinions as a heretic. In order to find out whether the label "heretical" could be transferred from the doctrine to its holders, a "test of pertinacity" had to be performed. The test consisted of the *revocatio*, the solemn recantation of the erroneous and heretical opinions. If an accused academic were to refuse to recant his "proved" errors, this would be considered a sure sign of his pertinacity.

Academics could, however, also be accused of heresy in a more implicit way. They could, for instance, be charged with holding

---

<sup>9</sup> The following literature has been most helpful: Russell, *Dissent* (as in n.8) 3-5, and also M.D. Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from Bogomil to Hus* (London 1977) vi-vii, and E. Peters, *Heresy and Authority in Medieval Europe: Documents in Translation* (Philadelphia 1980) 3-7. The complexity of the scholastic notion of heresy is made abundantly clear in W. Lourdaux, D. Verhelst (eds.), *The Concept of Heresy* (Louvain 1976).

<sup>10</sup> See Lambert, *Medieval Heresy* (as in n.9) 4; also R.W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste. The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe* (Oxford 1986) 292.

opinions against Catholic faith, Holy Scripture, Evangelical truth, or against sound doctrine (*sana doctrina*), thus causing scandal (*scandalum*) and endangering the souls of simple people (*simplices*). In addition, academics could be discredited by a broader application of the notion of heresy. In the documents related to academic condemnations one sees applied what Grundmann has called “the stereotyping of the heretic.”<sup>11</sup> The employment of a specific terminology in the documents would put the accused academics on a par with heretics. It was, for instance, stated that erring academics met in small groups, described as *conventicula*. The doctrines they were assumed to be exchanging and pronouncing at these occasions were described as dangerous, or even as diseases, as pestiferous. Furthermore, erring academics had the personality profile one finds usually attributed to “other” heretics: they were proud, presumptuous, and obstinate.

## 2. THE JUDICIAL PROCEDURES

On the basis of the documents, the following six phases can be distinguished in the judicial procedures against allegedly heretical academics: 1) initial allegations against an academic; 2) investigation of the allegations by an ecclesiastical authority; 3) the formal charge; 4) the defence; 5) the sentence; 6) the appeal (sometimes).

Judicial action could only start after the ecclesiastical authorities had been notified that an academic had been disseminating views that were supposedly against the Christian faith and good morals. More often than not initial accusations (*denunciatio*) seem to have come from those in the university itself, i.e. colleagues or students in the audience. This course of action was encouraged by an oath. Students and professors at the University of Paris had to swear under the penalty of excommunication that if they heard someone disseminating heresies, they would inform the bishop or the chancellor within fifteen days. However, those who provided the authorities with information regarding suspicious teaching did not always seem to have been motivated by purely religious concerns. A very colourful picture of academic Paris as a nest of jealousy and persecution is provided by the theologian Peter of Ceffons. If we may believe

---

<sup>11</sup> H. Grundmann, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart 1976-1978) vol.1, 314-315.



Peter's testimony the University of Paris was a place "where one fellow secretly denigrates (*detrahit*), more people indiscreetly slander what they have not understood," and where the reputations of virtuous men are destroyed by critics who "do such things out of zeal for the most Christian faith, which zeal, however, they fake like liars."<sup>12</sup>

Once the authorities had been informed, they had to start an inquisitorial procedure with the purpose of collecting evidence. As early as the twelfth century it was customary that ecclesiastical authorities (pope, bishop, minister general, or their representatives) would charge a commission of theologians with the task of scrutinising the relevant writings of the scholar whose views were under examination. The investigation could also concern unpublished material. If the commission did not find any false teachings, the matter would be dropped. If, however, the commission was of the opinion that the works under examination contained erroneous views, it would draw up a list of errors, or "articles" (*articuli*) as they were called. Towards the end of the thirteenth century, two new techniques were introduced for evaluating allegedly erroneous opinions. First, new categories were introduced for assessing the degree of error, if any. In addition to "erroneous" and "heretical," the commission could use labels such as "false," "presumptuous," "offensive to pious ears," "rash," "blasphemous," etc. The degree of error was determined by taking votes. Secondly, the articles or allegedly erroneous views were represented by literal excerpts from the teaching of the academic under investigation, instead of by paraphrases by members of the commission. As a result, the charges, and hence the discussion with the suspicious academic became more accurate. In cases where a list of articles was already extant—for instance, because a denouncer had sent his own list to the ecclesiastical authorities, or because it concerned an appeal—the assignment of the expert theologians was slightly different. Prior to assessing the degree of error, the members of the commission had to establish whether the allegedly erroneous views really stemmed from the teachings of the academic under investigation. In other words,

---

<sup>12</sup> The quotations from Peter of Ceffons are derived from L. Eldredge, "Changing Concepts of Church Authority in the Later Fourteenth Century: Peter Ceffons of Clairvaux and William Woodford, O.F.M.," *Revue de l'université d'Ottawa* 48 (1978) 170-178.

they had to establish whether the allegations were true. The commission of experts drew up a report consisting of the list (*rotulus*) of articles, with the degree of error indicated in the margin. This list provided the basis for the formal charges.

It seems that in general the commissions entrusted with collecting evidence of erroneous views worked carefully. But at this stage too other factors than intellectual accuracy and religious zeal could come to play a role. Peter of Ceffons was convinced that a commission of theologians would always find fault, "for they would think they had laboured in vain if they found nothing at all of heresy or of error." Moreover, the academic whose views were being examined could become the victim of the experts' incompetence. Ceffons claimed to have witnessed profound subtlety examined by ignorant peasants, and silenced as error by a judge into whose head "subtlety would have entered as easily as a fully loaded elephant could get through a ring finger." And the writings of his fellow Cistercian John of Mirecourt were, according to Ceffons, examined by a commission of "three wrinkled old women."<sup>13</sup>

Pending his trial or his appeal, the academic's physical movements could be curtailed for a considerable period of time. Academics whose views were under investigation could be imprisoned in the bishop's prison, or become subject to some kind of house-arrest in the Franciscan or Dominican convent at Avignon. Other forms of imprisonment available at Avignon were experienced by Thomas Waleys. He spent about ten years in the prisons of the inquisitor, and of the pope.<sup>14</sup> The worst, however, of what the various prisons had to offer was experienced by the Franciscan John of Roquetaillade (de Rupescissa). From 1344 John was imprisoned in several Franciscan convents under dreadful conditions, and these only got worse when, in 1349, he was transferred to the prison of Soudan at Avignon "enchained in irons of twenty-two pounds." Here he was so unfortunate as to have the company of the Benedictine Simon Legat, who had become insane. Simon spent his days chanting "heretic, heretic" and throwing his excrement at John, as one can learn from autobiographical interludes dispersed in John's works. In 1356 John of Roquetaillade was still imprisoned. He died in 1365

---

<sup>13</sup> See Eldredge, *Changing Concepts* (as in n.12).

<sup>14</sup> M. Dykmans, "A propos de Jean XXII et Benoît XII. La libération de Thomas Waleys", *Archivum Historiae Pontificae* 7 (1969) 115-130.

at the Franciscan convent in Avignon, where he was under house-arrest.<sup>15</sup>

Academics accused of holding heretical views were given the opportunity to defend themselves. The point of departure of the defence was the list of articles. If an academic admitted that the articles really stemmed from his teaching (oral, or written), the defence tended to focus on the meaning (*sensus*) of the articles. In one way or another, the academics would claim that the accusers had understood an excerpt in a different way than intended. Meister Eckhart, for instance, states that his judges err, in believing that everything that they do not understand is an error. "What can I do, if somebody does not understand," Eckhart asks himself, and in a response to one of the articles, he puts it this way: "The whole of what was said is false and absurd according to the imagination of my opponents, but it is true according to the true understanding."<sup>16</sup>

True understanding was the central issue in the defence of accused academics. The examiners, however, had a different approach. They evaluated the articles "as they sound" (*prout sonant*), or "as they stand" (*prout iacent*). Their concern, real or simulated, was the care of souls, to protect the *simplices* from falling into heresy, and in order to reach this goal, they did not mind sacrificing some of the subtlety of the academics. The fact in itself that the academic under investigation would need to make long explanations about the *true* meaning of what he had maintained made his views look suspicious. In sum, defendant and accuser were on different wave-lengths. The accused academic was focused on the meaning of his words, whereas the examiners were concerned with the potential effect of his words on the faithful.

The worst sanction for having disseminated erroneous views was public recantation (*revocatio*) of these false teachings and, in some cases, a temporary removal from one's teaching position. The recantation was indeed a supreme form of public humiliation. It usually took place in public in a specific church at Paris, or at the papal court at Avignon. The academic had to read loudly his offensive opinions one by one, and subsequently had to add "this is false

---

<sup>15</sup> See the article "Jean de Roquetaillade" by J. Bignami-Odier in *Histoire littéraire de la France* (Paris 1981) vol.41, 78-84.

<sup>16</sup> A. Daniels, *Eine Lateinische Rechtfertigungsschrift des Meister Eckhart* (Münster 1923) 12, 34, 54, and 65.

and heretical and should be recanted'' or words to that effect. He furthermore had to swear not to teach or defend the condemned views any more secretly or in public.

Academics who were willing to abjure their errors usually resumed their academic or ecclesiastical careers (although sometimes after a considerable lapse of time). Precisely because they recanted, they were not considered heretics, even though some of their opinions had at one time been considered as erroneous or heretical. The recantation proved that the academics were not stubbornly sticking to their errors, and hence, that they were not heretics.

### 3. ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TEACHING AUTHORITY

One of the most obvious questions raised by the documents pertaining to academic heresies concerns the exercise of doctrinal control and the limitations of academic freedom. To the modern reader, academic condemnations seem to exemplify Bury's generalisation that the Middle Ages were ''a millenium in which reason was enchained, thought was enslaved.'' <sup>17</sup> They seem to be striking manifestations of the limitations exerted by Christian faith on the thought and teaching of university masters. But is the modern concept of ''academic freedom'' really adequate in interpreting these medieval cases, and if so, in what sense?

The notion that academic freedom is absolutely essential to a university was only developed during the nineteenth century in Germany. <sup>18</sup> The German concept of academic freedom comprised the triad of principles, freedom to teach (*Lehrfreiheit*, i.e. without censure of the contents of the courses), students' freedom of learning (*Lernfreiheit*), and freedom of the academic institution to manage its immediate affairs (*Freiheit der Wissenschaft*). In the Middle Ages the nature of the academic institution, the professional identity of the intellectuals it produced, and the assumptions about the purpose of scholarly inquiry upon which the concept of academic freedom relied were all totally different from those of nineteenth-century

<sup>17</sup> J.B. Bury, *History of Freedom of Thought* (London 1913) 52.

<sup>18</sup> See W.P. Metzger, ''Academic Freedom and Scientific Freedom'', *Daedalus* 107 (1978) 93-115, 94-95; P. Classen, ''Libertas scolastica-Scholarenprivilegien-Akademische Freiheit im Mittelalter'', in: P. Classen, *Studium und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter*, hrsg. von J. Fried (Stuttgart 1983) 238-284, 238-241.

Germany. Consequently, it is not very surprising that only one of the three features of the German notion of academic freedom was ever explicitly discussed in medieval university documents. As Classen has shown in a penetrating study, the discussion of *libertas scholastica* in medieval documents referred to the freedom of the *universitas*, of the corporation of masters and students to manage its own affairs. This freedom encompassed all the privileges which had been granted to the academics individually or as an corporation by, for example, king or pope.<sup>19</sup> Freedom of learning and freedom of thought and expression, however, fell outside the scope of *libertas scholastica*. These concerns did not lie heavily on the minds of medieval academics.

Yet one must not go to the other extreme and totally deny the usefulness of the concept of academic freedom for an analysis of the medieval phenomenon of academic condemnations. Although explicit discussions of the limits of academic freedom are rare, the theologians Godfrey of Fontaines and Hervaeus Natalis made a few pertinent observations. Both authors distinguished between truths of faith and “neutral” truths. They maintained that if propositions concerning faith are involved, an academic should not get in the way of the authority of Sacred Scripture, the church, or any good doctrines. If, however, an academic discussion solely concerns “neutral” propositions, academics ought to be allowed freely to inquire after any possible solution. In particular Godfrey insists that for this reason, erroneous condemnations are reprehensible, because they prevent people from freely discussing (*libere tractare*) those truths that may perfect their rational faculties.<sup>20</sup> From the context it is clear that Godfrey is not insisting on the academic’s freedom of inquiry and expression, but on the idea of the pursuit of truth as long as faith is not involved. The impediment of “the inquiry into and knowledge of the truth” (*inquisitio et notitia veritatis*) that is caused by an

---

<sup>19</sup> Classen, *Libertas scolastica* (as in n.18) 255. Also E. Peters, “*Libertas inquiringi and the vitium curiositatis in Medieval Thought*”, in: G. Makdisi, D. Sourdel, J. Sourdel-Thomine (eds.), *La notion de liberté au moyen âge. Islam, Byzance, Occident* (Paris 1985) 89-98 is sensitive to this aspect. See further the important discussion of medieval academic freedom in J. Miethke, “*Bildungsstand und Freiheitsforderung (12. bis 14. Jahrhundert)*”, in: J. Fried, *Die Abendländische Freiheit vom 10. zum 14. Jahrhundert* (Sigmaringen 1991) 221-247, 231-240.

<sup>20</sup> M. de Wulf and J. Hoffmans (eds.), *Les Quodlibets V, VI, VII de Godefroid de Fontaines* (Louvain 1914) 403-404. The quotation is on p.404: . . . *nam homines non possunt libere tractare veritates quibus eorum intellectus non modicum perficeretur.*

erroneous condemnation only worries Godfrey with regard to subjects that do not concern faith.

Godfrey's and Hervaeus' discussions illustrate that the field for free intellectual discussion was restricted for those subjects that were related to faith. All issues that were either explicitly or implicitly connected to faith had to be discussed *salva fide*, i.e. with Catholic dogma unharmed. And this presupposition was never questioned by any medieval scholar. For this reason, the concept of academic freedom is of limited use in explaining the phenomenon of academic condemnations.

A better way of looking at academic condemnations is to consider them as manifestations of teaching authority, justified by intellectual and pastoral concerns. Academic condemnations were not simply an exercise of the power of jurisdiction by ecclesiastical authorities. Theologians were deliberately involved to lend the weight of their doctrinal expertise to the authoritative decisions of bishop or pope, although, strictly speaking, the force of their arguments was not needed to censure an erring scholar; for that the prelates' power of authority, their *auctoritas* or *potestas*, was sufficient. By discursive reasoning, however, it was *demonstrated* to the academic that he had erred, that his speculations had not been in keeping with revelation as held and taught by the Roman Church, or, in brief, that they did not conform to Catholic faith. The implication was that the academic had been opposing truth, and for this reason his views were disqualified as erroneous. As a scholar, the theologian was free in his use of the rational and analytical methods common to other scholarly disciplines, but as a theologian he had a special bond with the faith of the Catholic Church. Since, however, revelation was generally accepted as infallible truth, this special relationship to faith was not felt as a constraint. Propositions were censured as false or erroneous precisely because they were not in accordance with faith, i.e. were contrary to truth. The ecclesiastical authorities felt justified in crushing allegedly erroneous opinions, because they rightly believed that it is impossible to give a valid proof of what is contrary to truth. In other words, the truth was on the side of the judges. It was the yardstick with which they measured theological opinion. To view academic condemnations solely in terms of restrictions on academic freedom or the imprisonment of reason is to ignore this important rational aspect in the process of examining and censuring medieval academics.

Any conception of academic freedom must be attuned to a particular academic system.

In addition, there was a strong pastoral aspect to academic condemnations, expressed in censures such as “ill-sounding,” “scandalous,” “temerarious,” and “heretical.” Ecclesiastical authorities were concerned with the effect of learned words on the simple minds (*simplices*) in the audience (for instance, during sermons). Erring academics were accused of leading astray the simple believers with their incautious discourse (*incauta locutio*), thus endangering their salvation.<sup>21</sup> The dissemination of views offensive to pious ears had to be prohibited because of its harmful effects.

---

<sup>21</sup> Gregory the Great, *Pastorale*, II.4 (PL 77, 30): *Ne igitur incauta locutio simplices pertrahat in errorem.*

## LUDWIG THE BAVARIAN AND THE SCHOLARS

DICK E.H. DE BOER

Through the ages, the importance of knowledge as a function of power turned princely residences into centres of learning. Where power shifted from dynasty to dynasty and from residence to residence, the link between scholarship and the centre of power was weak. During the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, conditions in the German Empire north of the Alps were unpropitious for the development of centres of learning, even though imperial policy required scholarly support. At a slightly later period, Munich would emerge as a domicile of scholars, and it is with this development that the present paper is concerned.

### A FOREIGN VISITOR

In the year 1287-1288 Raban Sāwmā, from Khān Bālīk, visited Europe on a diplomatic mission.<sup>1</sup> When this nestorian monk was staying in Rome the cardinals showed him in St Peter's church an

altar at which the King of their Kings... is proclaimed *Amprōr King of Kings*, and... after the prayers *Mār Pāpā* takes up the crown and clothes the *Amprōr* with it, that is to say, places it upon his own head... as they say that priesthood reigneth over sovereignty...<sup>2</sup>

It is misleading to suppose that Sāwmā misunderstood the crowning of an emperor, and likewise to blame his informants for their version of the procedure, which simply represented the theory of the *plenitudo potestatis*.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, how could they know differently; no emperor had been crowned since Honorius III invested Frederick II

---

<sup>1</sup> Also Rabban Sauma: M. Rossabi, *Khubilai Khan. His life and times* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1988) 152. My quotations are from E.A. Wallis Budge, *The Monks of Kublai Khan, Emperor of China* (London 1973<sup>2</sup>) 45.

<sup>2</sup> Wallis Budge, *Monks* (as in n.1) 178-179.

<sup>3</sup> I.S. Robinson, "Church and Papacy", in: J.H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval political thought, c.350-c.1450* (Cambridge 1988) 282-288.



with his powers in the 1220s, following a procedure that resembled the one explained to Raban Sāwmā.<sup>4</sup>

During the Interregnum, the emperorship remained vacant as well. The election of Rudolf of Habsburg to kingship in 1273 did not bring the title back to Germany; only towards the end of his reign did the new king aim at the imperial crown, although he was to find the papal demands too high.<sup>5</sup> Although Sāwmā met someone “from the country of Almādān (= Alamannia), . . . who was the *periodeutēs* . . . on his way to Rome”,<sup>6</sup> this official did not travel to Germany. The *periodeutēs* was a papal legate, returning from Austria, once the negotiations about the imperial title failed.<sup>7</sup> As long as there was no *Amprōr*, no acquaintance in Germany seemed necessary. Instead, Sāwmā visited king Philip the Fair in “the country of Pārīz”.<sup>8</sup> He was amazed to find in Paris

thirty thousand scholars . . . engaged in the study of ecclesiastical books of instruction . . . and of profane learning; and they studied . . . philosophy, and speaking, and healing, geometry, arithmetic and the science of the planets and the stars . . . and all these scholars received money for subsistence from the king.<sup>9</sup>

However exaggerated, Sāwmā’s interpretation was correct: Paris was a true centre of learning, and the French king knew the importance of scholarly education.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> D. Abulafia, *Frederick II, A Medieval Emperor* (London 1988) 137-138; Th.C. van Cleve, *The Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen. Immulator mundi* (Oxford 1972) 132-133. R. Elze, *Päpste-Kaiser-Könige und die mittelalterliche Herrschaftssymbolik*, V. *Eine Kaiserkrönung um 1200* (London 1982) edits the Staufische *Ordo*; the coronation, however, is not very accurately described.

<sup>5</sup> H. Grundmann, *Wahlkönigtum, Territorialpolitik und Ostbewegung im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert, 1198-1378*, *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte*, Bd. 5 (Munich 1973) 105ff.

<sup>6</sup> Wallis Budge, *Monks* (as in n.1) 187.

<sup>7</sup> Since the end of 1285, John of Tusculum had been negotiating the coronation of Rudolf; Wallis Budge, *Monks* (as in n.1) 69. Grundmann, *Wahlkönigtum* (as in n.5) 108-109, confirms that a coronation was intended at Candlemas 1287, only to be cancelled. At a German Diet in march 1288 the papal envoy was strongly opposed by the German clergy. J.N.D. Kelly, *Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford 1986) 205.

<sup>8</sup> In 1291 Sāwmā negotiated an agreement between Philip IV and the Persian il-khan on sending a French army to start an offensive against the Mamluks. Pope Nicholas IV favoured this enterprise. See Sylvia Schein, *Fideles Crucis. The Papacy, the West, and the Recovery of the Holy Land, 1274-1314* (Oxford 1991) 88.

<sup>9</sup> Wallis Budge, *Monks* (as in n.1) 183-184.

<sup>10</sup> During the years 1287-1289, Raymondus Lullus taught in Paris, alongside

These events introduce the central problems relevant to an analysis of the importance of learning in Munich during the early fourteenth century, and of the symbiosis of the emperor and his 'Hofakademie'.<sup>11</sup> We have to look at the foundations of imperial power, to understand how far learning played a functional role at the court of Ludwig the Bavarian.

In 1294, at the age of twelve, Ludwig succeeded his father Ludwig the Severe as duke of Upper-Bavaria.<sup>12</sup> In the mid-thirteenth century Munich had become the residence of the Bavarian dukes. The rebuilding of 'das Alte Hof' into a 'Herzogsburg' catalysed urban life, and enabled Munich to equal the episcopal town of Regensburg, the ancient capital of Bavaria.<sup>13</sup> After the election of Ludwig the Bavarian as king in 1314, the town became the seat of government for the Empire. Nevertheless, around 1330 its character was still that of an 'Ackerbürgerstadt', and the population did not exceed the number of 10.000 inhabitants.<sup>14</sup> Ludwig strongly favoured his residence by granting privileges to the civic community; the most important of these, the 'golden bull' of 1332, secured the possession of the salt-staple.<sup>15</sup> All the salt of the earth, however, does not create a centre of learning. In fact, north of the Alps and east of the Rhine, hardly any centre of learning existed during the early fourteenth century, apart from the small episcopal ones. No one had yet taken the initiative to upgrade a school to the status of university.<sup>16</sup>

---

famous political theorists such as Giles of Rome; see A. Tuilier (ed.), *La vie universitaire parisienne au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris 1974) 161-163; G. Leff, *Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries. An Institutional and Intellectual History* (New York/London/Sydney 1968) 300-301. From being a propagandist of a peaceful recovery of the Holy Land Lullus turned into a champion of armed crusade, and of the simultaneous conversion of the Mongols; Schein, *Fideles Crucis* (as in n.8) 102-107. A meeting with Säwmā squares with this change of mind.

<sup>11</sup> K. Bosl, 'Die "geistliche Hofakademie" Kaiser Ludwigs des Bayern im alten Franziskanerkloster zu München', in: *Der Mönch im Wappen. Aus Geschichte und Gegenwart des katholischen München* (Munich 1961) 97-129.

<sup>12</sup> G. Benker, *Ludwig der Bayer. Ein Wittelsbacher auf dem Kaiserthron 1282-1347* (Munich 1980) 17.

<sup>13</sup> Bosl, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 97.

<sup>14</sup> Benker, *Ludwig* (as in n.12) 207.

<sup>15</sup> For the development of Munich, see K. Bosl, *München* (Munich 1971); F. Solleder, *München im Mittelalter* (Munich 1938) is still useful.

<sup>16</sup> For the question of urban, papal or princely initiative, see F. Rexroth, *Deutsche Universitätsstiftungen von Prag bis Köln. Die Intentionen des Stifters und die Wege und Chancen ihrer Verwirklichung im spätmittelalterlichen deutschen Territorialstaat*, Beihefte zum Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 34 (Köln/Weimar/Wien 1992).

A coincidence of conflict within the world of dogma and canon law on the one side, with that within the world of politics on the other, seems to have been responsible for allowing Ludwig to profit from the scholars whom he sheltered in Munich.

#### SUCCESSION AND SCHOLARS

Describing the role of scholars at the court of Ludwig's successor, Charles IV, Kavka stated that in the fourteenth century one encountered no longer the

in unmittelbarem Dienst am Herrscher wirkenden Gelehrten, wie er für die Hoch- und Spätscholastik typisch war. Plätze der Wissenschaft waren nun die Universitäten und die Klöster . . . geworden.<sup>17</sup>

Although the scientific and literary activities in Prague have been labelled as "Frühhumanismus",<sup>18</sup> Kavka thought the scholars at the Bohemian court to be scientifically trained servants of the crown, rather than creative researchers. Nevertheless Prague rose to fame, not least because Charles had a clear inclination towards and an undeniable talent for science. He connected the 'Gelehrsamkeit' at his court with a cultural policy that contributed to royal status, and which thus became an intrinsic foundation of power.

The tradition of the use of learning by the Luxemburg dynasty goes back to the reign of Henry VII. Although Henry was succeeded by a member of the Wittelsbach dynasty, the house of Luxemburg preserved its political importance, as a result of a

Herrschaftspraxis . . . die durch die systematische Heranziehung geeigneter, auch an Universitäten geschulter Mitarbeiter, durch intensive schriftliche Erfassung politischer und administrativer Vorgänge sowie durch den Aufbau einer effektiven Verwaltung zielstrebiges und koordiniertes politisches Handeln über längere Zeiträume ermöglichte.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> F. Kavka, "Die Hofgelehrten", in: F. Seibt (ed.) *Kaiser Karl IV, Staatsmann und Mäzen* (Munich 1978) 249-253.

<sup>18</sup> J. Macek, "Die Hofkultur Karls IV", in: Seibt (ed.) *Kaiser* (as in n.17) 237-242, modified this, by pointing (p.239) to the absence of systematic research into the classical heritage.

<sup>19</sup> H.J. Schmidt, "Politisches Handeln und politische Programmatik im Dienst der Luxemburger: Daniel von Wichterich, Bischof von Verden († 1364)", *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 16 (1989) 130.

In doing this, the Luxemburg family followed the example of the French kings.

The activities of one prominent figure, Daniel von Wichterich, show the indirect importance of such scholars for Ludwig as well. Daniel was the suffragan of archbishop Baldwin of Trier, who started as a supporter of Ludwig the Bavarian, but went over to the Luxemburg faction. He wrote a *pontificale*, containing an *ordo coronationis* with statements about the relation between the German king and the electors. This *ordo* can be read as a justification of Ludwig's election in 1314.<sup>20</sup>

To see whether Ludwig the Bavarian not only profited from a distance, but also borrowed the 'Herrschaftspraxis' at court, we have to return to his predecessor. Henry VII was the first king since 1220 to go to the trouble of a trip to Rome to obtain the imperial crown. As the pope had left already for Avignon, cardinal-legate Nicolas of Prato performed the ceremony in 1312, in the church of the Lateran, while street-fighting blocked the way to St Peter's. Among the nobles who participated, the Colonna-clan, led by Sciarra Colonna, embodied the threat of the Romans to choose 'their' emperor, if the pope failed to return.<sup>21</sup> Although the papacy allowed Henry's coronation, problems arose concerning the exercise of power in Italy. The events renewed the dispute about the *plenitudo potestatis* that had led to the bitter controversy between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair, and resulted in the hold-up of the pope near Anagni in 1303. In the decades before 1312 the weapon of theory was mainly used in the battle between the pope and the king of France.<sup>22</sup> The writings pertaining to their controversy could not simply be employed to serve the combat between pope and emperor, especially since the predominance of French cardinals in Avignon had turned the papacy into an instrument of French policy.

The procedure for the election of the German king was likewise disputed. At the basis of the 'Wahlkönigtum' stood the principle of the election by all German princes, but gradually the choice was

<sup>20</sup> Ibidem 137 and 139.

<sup>21</sup> Grundmann, *Wahlkönigtum* (as in n.5) 150-151; F.X. Seppelt, *Geschichte der Päpste von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts*. IV. *Das Papsttum im Spätmittelalter und in der Renaissance. Von Bonifaz VIII bis Zu Klemens VII* (Munich 1957) 19ff.; Kelly, *Dictionary* (as in n.7) 206.

<sup>22</sup> E.g. Giles of Rome, *De regimine principum*; J. Dubabin, "Government", in: Burns, *Political thought* (as in n.3) 483ff.

restricted to a group of electors. Although there was an agreement about the number and identity of the electors, this was unwritten law.<sup>23</sup> After the death of Henry VII the lack of a solid procedure caused the problematic double-election on both banks of the river Main.<sup>24</sup> Accordingly Frederick of Austria was crowned on 25 November 1314 by the right man (the archbishop of Cologne) in the wrong place (Bonn), while on the same day Ludwig of Upper-Bavaria was crowned by the wrong man (the archbishop of Mainz) in the right place (Aix-la-Chapelle).

Although legal strife broke out immediately after the coronation, Ludwig relied on his trusted advisers instead of experienced theorists. The most influential of these advisors was Peter von Aspelt, archbishop of Mainz, and former chancellor of the Bohemian kings. Meanwhile, the king rapidly replaced his small, hardly specialised Bavarian chancery by a new one, composed of technocrats rather than of scholars.<sup>25</sup> The absence of a central apparatus, which would stay intact after the death of a king, was one of the consequences of the lack of dynastic continuity. A specialised chancery of notaries had to set up a new administration *and* to prepare Ludwig's defence in the legal combat that awaited him. In the early years of his reign the king did not yet look for help from scholars outside his administration to give his claims a theoretical foundation. Of course treatises already existed on the relationship between state and church, even by German scholars, such as Alexander of Roes, Jordan of Osnabrück or Lupold of Bebenburg; but these were not written at the request of Ludwig.<sup>26</sup> Even the death of Peter von Aspelt, in 1320, brought no change to this situation.<sup>27</sup> This seems to indicate the lack of an intellectual tradition in support of the sovereign. Only the activities of Daniel of Verden show the 'silent' support from outside.

---

<sup>23</sup> Grundmann, *Wahlkönigtum* (as in n.5) 163.

<sup>24</sup> Benker, *Ludwig* (as in n.12) 84.

<sup>25</sup> H. Bansa, *Studien zur Kanzlei Ludwigs des Bayern vom Tag der Wahl bis zur Rückkehr aus Italien (1314-1329)*, Münchener historische Studien Abt. hist. Hilfswissenschaften, Bd. 5 (Kallmünz 1968).

<sup>26</sup> K. Bosl, "Der geistige Widerstand am Hofe Ludwigs des Bayern gegen die Kurie. Die politische Ideenwelt um die Wende vom 13./14. Jahrhundert und ihr historisches Milieu in Europa", in: H. Heimpel et al. (eds.), *Die Welt zur Zeit des konstanzer Konzils*, Vorträge und Forschungen IX (Stuttgart 1965) 99-119.

<sup>27</sup> Bansa, *Kanzlei* (as in n.25) 67.

## MÜHLDOF, MARRIAGE AND MARSILIUS

The king, who “selbst des Schreibens und Lesens in lateinischer Sprache weitgehend unkundig war”,<sup>28</sup> preferred the vocabulary of money and weapons. On 28 September 1322, a break-through was forced.<sup>29</sup> Near Mühl Dorf Ludwig’s army against all odds defeated a much larger Habsburg army. The only ‘scholar’ supporting Ludwig on this occasion was Arnold of Regensburg, a well-known astronomer, who predicted the victory.<sup>30</sup> Soon afterwards the *imperial insignia*, which for a long time had been kept in the Habsburg family, were with great pomp brought to Munich.<sup>31</sup> Within his own realm Ludwig’s power was hardly disputed anymore.

If one divides Ludwig’s reign into four periods of eight years, the battle near Mühl Dorf marks the end of the first period. These years were taken up with the establishing of power, and they ended with the king holding the German lands in his grip, albeit without papal recognition. The second period, from 1322 until 1330, is marked by the king’s excommunication and his efforts to win the imperial title. His return in Munich, as the crowned head of the Empire, brings this period to a close. During the third period the struggle with the papacy was changed into a bitter fight; this resulted in 1338 in the declaration of Rhense, which denied the pope any role in the election of the emperor. The last phase, which ended abruptly with Ludwig’s death from an apoplexy in 1347, offered Ludwig the challenge of a new rival: king Charles of Bohemia. We shall see to what extent learning played a role in imperial policy.

In the same year as that of his victory near Mühl Dorf, Ludwig suffered the loss of his first wife. Now he was free to negotiate a wedding that could serve his policy. As a result he married, in February 1324, Margaret, daughter of count William of Hainault, Holland and Zealand, who on the periphery of the Empire had acquired a dominancy that made his daughters sought-after brides on the European wedding-scene.<sup>32</sup> At the same time Ludwig’s problems

---

<sup>28</sup> Schmidt, *Politisches Handeln* (as in n.19); Benker, *Ludwig* (as in n.12) 23, is more complimentary.

<sup>29</sup> H. Stob, *Kaiser Karl IV und seine Zeit* (Graz/Wien/Köln 1990) 20.

<sup>30</sup> Benker, *Ludwig* (as in n.12) 102.

<sup>31</sup> Ibidem 205.

<sup>32</sup> H.S. Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years War, 1326-1347* (Philadelphia 1976<sup>2</sup>) 48.

were growing. In March 1224, in spite of two *appellationes ante sententiam*, written by notary Ulrich Wild,<sup>33</sup> pope John XXII excommunicated Ludwig as the false king of Germany. Should one expect to find an increasing number of scholars at court for this reason, the result is disappointing. Even the supposition, that the scholars that would soon assemble in Munich were influencing the *appellationes* already, has been rejected.<sup>34</sup> However, changes that originated in Avignon, where John XXII was accused of heresy in a controversy about apostolic poverty, were forthcoming.

The year 1324 also witnessed the appearance of a book by an author who for the time being remained anonymous: the *Defensor Pacis*. This mixture of Aristotelian thought and the political experiences of Italian city-republics, although not written at his request, served Ludwig excellently, by denying papal authority in worldly administration, and offering the emperor the theoretical basis for his claims. As soon as the identity of the author, Marsilius de Mainardino (of Padua), was revealed, he had to leave Paris, where he had been teaching. Together with his colleague John of Jandun (who was held responsible for parts of the *Defensor*) Marsilius in 1326 sought refuge with the German king. Contrary to what one would expect, the scholars were not welcomed with enthusiasm, but were only allowed to appear at court after a period in which they were held at a distance.

Although the qualification that "the *Defensor Pacis* had the fortunate privilege of being immediately put into practice in the historical and political reality of its day" is an exaggeration,<sup>35</sup> Marsilius became an influential advisor of king Ludwig. Not so much his fame as a theorist was of use, but rather his experience in the service of the Cangrande in Verona and of the Viscontis. His first, and perhaps most important task was the preparation of the Italian journey, that brought Ludwig the imperial title.<sup>36</sup> First Marsilius

---

<sup>33</sup> H.J. Becker, *Die Appellation vom Papst an ein allgemeines Konzil. Historische Entwicklung und kanonistische Diskussion im späten Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit* (Wien 1988) 89.

<sup>34</sup> Ibidem 90-94.

<sup>35</sup> J. Quillet, cited by A. Black, *Political Thought in Europe, 1250-1450* (Cambridge 1992) 58.

<sup>36</sup> M. Berg, "Der Italienzug Ludwigs des Bayern. Das Itinerar der Jahre 1327-1330", *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 67 (1987) 142-197.

prepared the coronation with the Lombard crown in Milan, in 1327.<sup>37</sup> Afterwards his diplomacy strongly contributed to the triumphal entry of Ludwig into Rome on 7 January 1328,<sup>38</sup> and the coronation in St Peter's ten days later, by Sciarra Colonna, assisted by the abbot-bishop of Avila. In order to secure the formal support by the church, Ludwig deposed pope John XXII, and issued a declaration, that future popes should once more choose Rome as their residence. The logical consequence was the election of Peter of Corvaro as (anti)pope Nicholas V, by an assembly presided over by Marsilius as *vicarius in spiritualibus*.<sup>39</sup>

#### THE SCHOLARS ARE MARCHING IN

On his return to the north Ludwig met the first scholars who were to garrison his intellectual fortress. In september 1328 the emperor reached Pisa, accompanied by Marsilius of Padua.<sup>40</sup> There they encountered Michael of Cesena (former minister-general of the Franciscan order), Bonagratia of Bergamo (former procurator of the order) and William of Ockham. The first had led the opposition against the pope in the controversy about apostolic poverty. The others had supported him, and for that reason they were accused of heresy as well.<sup>41</sup> When in March 1328 Michael's condemnation was at hand, they fled Avignon. Heinrich von Thalheim, former procurator of the Franciscan province of Upper Germany, and faithful supporter of Ludwig, probably accompanied them as well.<sup>42</sup> Heinrich was forced to abdicate when the chapter of Konstanz, for political reasons, did not re-elect him in 1326; this very fact makes Heinrich a good example of the widening circle of intellectuals who supported Ludwig's reign.

<sup>37</sup> Ibidem 148.

<sup>38</sup> Ibidem 168; 169 n.110, about the influence of Marsilius' ideas.

<sup>39</sup> Ibidem 173. For Marsilius being the author of the deposition-sentence of John XXII, see M. Greschat (ed.), *Das Papsttum. I. Von den Anfängen bis zu den Päpste in Avignon* (Stuttgart/Berlin 1984) 265.

<sup>40</sup> Berg, *Italienzug* (as in n.36) 179 n.155. John of Jandun died on his way from Rome to Ferrara.

<sup>41</sup> Ibidem 182-183; Bosl, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 109ff.

<sup>42</sup> C.K. Brampton, "Ockham, Bonagratia and the Emperor Lewis IV", *Medieval Aevum* 31 (1962) 81-87. Berg, *Italienzug* (as in n.36) 182 mentions the presence of Francesco of Ascoli. Bosl, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 108, only mentions him in Munich, in the possible company of Francesco da Marco and Jacopo de Castello, without referring to the meeting in Pisa.



Although no one believes anymore that William of Ockham on this occasion really said “O emperor, defend me with your sword, and I will defend you with my pen”,<sup>43</sup> the dramatic effect of these words reflects the importance often attributed to their co-operation. Although Ockham was essentially a philosopher and theologian,<sup>44</sup> many have labelled him an pamphlettist.<sup>45</sup> Brampton, however, has emphasised that Bonagratia was the engaged valuable political advisor of Ludwig.<sup>46</sup> The group that assembled in the 1330s in Munich had other members of less fame, but with more importance. Bosl reconstructed this group by using the names of the theologians and jurists present in the refectory of the Minorites in Munich on 7 April 1330, when Michael of Cesena presented his *appellatio* against the papal statute *Quia vir reprobus*,<sup>47</sup> and the names of the witnesses, inscribed in 1333 after a draft of an *appellatio*, by Bonagratia of Bergamo, against pope John’s doctrine on poverty.<sup>48</sup> For a long time Cesena continued to lead the struggle against the papacy, while Ockham and Marsilius stayed in the background. In fact, Ludwig made more use of the talents of jurists, than of the capacities of ‘his’ scholars.<sup>49</sup>

Von Riezler’s famous statement,

in zehn bis zwanzig Jahren ist damals von diesem Dutzend Fremder im Münchener Barfüßerkloster und der Herzogsburg wahrscheinlich mehr theoretisiert, gegrübelt und geschrieben worden, als von allen Tausenden biederer Münchener, die seit Gründung der Stadt gelebt haben—ganze Generationen der Nachfahren noch eingeschlossen,

---

<sup>43</sup> Brampton, *Ockham and Lewis* (as in n.42) 81-87; Bosl, *Geistige Widerstand* (as in n.26) 99.

<sup>44</sup> Bosl, *Geistige Widerstand* (as in n.26) 109; idem, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 100.

<sup>45</sup> E.g. R. Friedenthal, *Ketzer und Rebell. Jan Hus und das Jahrhundert der Revolutionskrieg* (Munich 1972) 56-57: “mit Ockham . . . waren die Universitätslehrer . . . schon nachdrücklich über die Grenzen der Universität hinaus getreten. Sie . . . wurden Publizisten von Brochüren”.

<sup>46</sup> Brampton, *Ockham and Lewis* (as in n.42).

<sup>47</sup> Bosl, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 102-103. Michael probably prepared this appeal on his way from Pisa to Munich. For an analysis of his writings, see Becker, *Appellation* (as in n.33) 290ff.

<sup>48</sup> Bosl, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 100-101; both are preserved in the codex Vaticanus 4009, which may have been a personal register of Michael of Cesena.

<sup>49</sup> E.g. canon Marquart of Randegg in the negotiations with the papacy; see H.O. Schwöbel, *Der diplomatische Kampf zwischen Ludwig dem Bayern und der Römischen Kurie im Rahmen des kanonischen Absolutionsprozesses 1330-1346* (Weimar 1968) passim.

is still quoted with approval.<sup>50</sup> One writer has even added that these activities qualified Munich as “geistiges Idee- und Kampfbereich allerersten Ranges neben Paris und Oxford”,<sup>51</sup> although some have realised that it was not the renown of the imperial court that lured the scholars to Munich, but the hope of there being free from prosecution by the papacy.<sup>52</sup> However this may be, when in 1330 Ludwig finally came home from his Italian expedition, the ‘Hofakademie’ was complete.

While the first consideration of the scholars seems to have been their controversy with the papacy, it is interesting to see the emperor’s unease at this situation. In 1336, Ludwig admitted that he had housed the *fratres minores rebelles ecclesiae*; declared that he had supported their writings concerning the *iurisdictio imperialis*, but that he was unable to judge their opinion about the poverty of Christ. He even stated his intention of bringing them back into the fold of the Church, and he explicitly distanced himself from heretical opinions of Marsilius and (the now dead) John of Jandun. Remarkably enough, the emperor justified his giving shelter to these scholars with the argument that “they were considered to be good priests and learned professors”.<sup>53</sup> So the efforts to work out a reconciliation between emperor and pope during the year 1336 and 1337 had the effect that Ludwig distanced himself partially from the scholars at court, at least from the convictions in the theological debate that were so crucial for them.

These observations make one curious about the real contributions made by the scholars to the policy of the emperor who offered them shelter. Marsilius of Padua was for a long time the only celebrity who produced writings that served everyday politics. In the mid-1330s he published his *Tractatus de translatione imperii*, and, shortly before his death, around 1342, he concluded with the *Defensor Minor*.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> E.g. A. Schütz, “Der Kampf Ludwigs des Bayern gegen Papst Johannes XXII und die Rolle der Gelehrten am Münchener Hof”, in: H. Glaser (ed.), *Wittelsbach und Bayern. Die Zeit der frühen Herzöge. Von Otto I. zu Ludwig dem Bayern*, Beiträge zur bayerischen Geschichte und Kunst, 1180-1350 (Munich/Zürich 1980) 388-389, following Bosl, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 98-99.

<sup>51</sup> Benker, *Ludwig* (as in n.12) 208.

<sup>52</sup> Schütz, *Kampf* (as in n.50) 393.

<sup>53</sup> Bosl, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 105.

<sup>54</sup> Bosl, *Geistige Widerstand* (as in n.26) 109; Stoob, *Karl IV* (as in n.29) 24, considers the *Dialogus . . . de imperatorum et pontificum potestate* to be Marsilius’ “wichtigste politische Schrift”.

But even the *Defensor Maior* seems to have influenced others only in the late 1330s and early 1340s. Only from then does Ockham seem to have concerned himself with the text of his 'colleague', although the two are supposed to have been working closely together throughout all these years.<sup>55</sup> William of Ockham indeed wrote the majority of his works in Munich, but the writings with a political intention are only a small minority of his *oeuvre*. It took him a very long time to express himself in favour of the emperor, since he remained more concerned with the struggle between the mendicants and the papacy. Moreover, he addressed his first political writings, written in Munich, to Edward III of England instead of Ludwig,<sup>56</sup> and the chronology of these writings still holds, that they date from the years 1337-1338 and after. Only at a late moment did Ockham start to join the polemics about the legitimacy of Ludwig's position.<sup>57</sup> In fact, in his *Octo Quaestiones* Ockham reacted to the *tractatus de iuribus regni et imperii*, finished on 3 February 1340 by Lupold of Bebenburg, as to an attack on Ludwig.<sup>58</sup> For the chronology of Ockham's political influence this is an important observation, as it dates his involvement to *after* the crisis of 1338. Only in the *Consultatio de causa matrimoniali*, in 1342, did he use his pen for the first time clearly for the sake of the emperor.<sup>59</sup>

The end of the third period of eight years of Ludwig's reign, is marked by the proclamation of the ordinances *Fidem catholicam* and *Licet iuris*. The first was proclaimed at the Diet at Frankfurt in May 1338, and it declared the German kingship to be *Gottunmittelbar*. The next month the electors assembled at Rhense and agreed that a king, created by their choice, needed no confirmation by any other

---

<sup>55</sup> H.S. Offler, 'The 'Influence' of Ockham's Political Thinking', in: W. Vossenkuhl, R. Schönberger (eds.), *Die Gegenwart Ockhams* (Weinheim 1990) 338-365, 346.

<sup>56</sup> C.J. Nederman, 'Royal taxation and the English Church: The origins of William of Ockham's *An Princeps*', *JEH* 37 (1986) 377-388.

<sup>57</sup> Bosl, *Geistige Widerstand* (as in n.26) 110-111, dates the start of productivity in 1333 and attributes to Ockham an active role in the 'Approbationsfrage' and the ordinances of the year 1338, although 'ein exakter Beweis nicht möglich ist'.

<sup>58</sup> A.G. Weiler, 'The foundations of the superior secular and spiritual powers according to William of Ockham's *Octo Quaestiones de Potestate Papae*', in: E.P. Bos, H.A. Krop (eds.), *Ockham and Ockhamists. Acts of the symposium organized by the Dutch Society for Medieval Philosophy Medium Aevum on the occasion of its 10th anniversary* (Leiden, 10-20 september 1986) (Nijmegen 1987) 145-152; H.S. Offler (ed.), *Guillelmi de Ockham, Opera Politica*, vol.1 (Manchester 1974<sup>2</sup>) 9.

<sup>59</sup> Offler, *Influence* (as in n.55); idem, *Opera* (as in n.58) 273.

authority. At another diet at Frankfurt, on 6 August, an even more decided stand was taken in the ordinance *Licet juris*, stating that

under the law and the of old approved customs of the realm someone who is chosen by the electors unanimously or by majority of votes to be emperor or king, by this election alone is to be considered and to be called the true king *and emperor of the Romans* . . .

Bosl's opinion that Ockham was responsible for these texts is no longer accepted. Several authors have proved that the *auctor intellectualis* of the Rhens text was archbishop Baldwin of Trier.<sup>60</sup> The *Licet Iuris* is commonly attributed to Bonagratia of Bergamo,<sup>61</sup> who also seems to have been the author of the treatise *Allegaciones de potestate imperiali*.<sup>62</sup> If Ockham and Marsilius may still be counted as supporters of the tenor of these public acts, they shared their interest in with the subject with many others.

#### THE 'HOFAKADEMIE' DIES OUT

The crisis of 1338 once more forced emperor and scholars upon each other during the fourth period of Ludwig's reign. The last years of Marsilius, until his death in 1343, seem to have been the only period during which the whole 'Hofakademie' was involved in the political problems in the empire. The election of Charles IV as anti-king in 1346 roused much pamphlettism. But by then the intimate circle of scholars of superior standard already had partially died out, and this left William of Ockham the role of defender of the emperor. An important loss to the imperial policy, was the defection of archbishop Baldwin of Trier, who, after the election of pope Clement VI in 1342, gradually went over to the papal side and strengthened the Luxemburg faction in the Empire. The definite breach came in May 1346, a few weeks before Baldwin participated in the election of Charles of Bohemia.<sup>63</sup> Ockham, who died in 1349, outlived his patron Ludwig for two years. This partially explains the impression

---

<sup>60</sup> Stoob, *Karl IV* (as in n.29) 36; Bosl, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 118-119: "Ockhams Mitwirkung an der berühmten Kaisserrede auf dem Frankfurter Reichstag 1338, beim Gesetz 'Fidem catholicam' von mai 1338 und . . . beim gesetz 'Licet iuris' ist sicher".

<sup>61</sup> Schütz, *Kampf* (as in n.43).

<sup>62</sup> Offler, *Opera* (as in n.58); according to Bosl, *Geistige Widerstand* (as in n.27) 111, the *Allegaciones* were written by Ockham in support of *Fidem catholicam*.

<sup>63</sup> Benker, *Ludwig* (as in n.12) 255-257.

that in the end Ockham's contribution to Ludwig's policy was more important than that of Marsilius. During these last years Ockham seems to have written the *Breviloquium de potestate tyrannica* and the treatise *De imperatorum et pontificum potestate*, that appeared shortly after the sudden death of Ludwig in 1347.<sup>64</sup> Bosl favours this view, and quotes the *Prologus in Dialogum*, in which Ockham poses as the theorist and bibliographer of Ludwig's policy, as he urges the emperor *omnes libellos et opera adversariorum contra dominum summum pontificem niteris congerare: in quibus sine intermissione studes*.<sup>65</sup>

In surveying the reign of Ludwig, one may be impressed by the talents that joined forces in Munich, while nonetheless being disappointed as well. It is true that the greatest scholars did play an important role, but they are outnumbered by the lesser talents. If, in admiration of the intellectual potential, we still repeat Bosl's words "München war von 1329/30 bis 1348/9 wie wenige Zentren Europas ein Mittelpunkt des Forschens und der Erarbeitung neuer Erkenntnis",<sup>66</sup> we cannot escape the question: what kept them there so long? In fact one is obliged to ask whether Ludwig the Bavarian, when sheltering these men in Munich, had any masterplan.

#### A BAVARIAN UNIVERSITY?

Their life in Munich gave Marsilius, Ockham and their companions freedom to write, but it also deprived them of much. Gordon Leff implies that they fled to intellectual isolation: "they were lost to the life of the schools, to which in their preoccupation with political issues, they did not even contribute from afar with new writings".<sup>67</sup> Would it be too much of a speculation to suppose that they were kept intellectually alive by the hope of new opportunities? If this conclusion is right, that the political impact of the court activities of most of the scholars that resided in Munich was limited, we have to wonder if the protection by the emperor was indeed so essential for these outcasts of the Holy Mother church. Could they not find another place in the world where they would be respected for their learning and tolerated for their convictions? Or were they indeed cloistered and bound in Munich?

<sup>64</sup> Bosl, *Geistige Widerstand* (as in n.26) 111.

<sup>65</sup> Bosl, *Hofakademie* (as in n.11) 100.

<sup>66</sup> Ibidem 128.

<sup>67</sup> Leff, *Universities* (as in n.14) 249.

In his statement about their value as professors, the king might have offered a solution for these questions. As contrasted with Charles IV, Ludwig the Bavarian had no personal talent in learning, but he understood the importance of scholars and the products of their pens. Attention has always been focused on the defence of his position as disputed king and excommunicated emperor. Of course the help of Marsilius was of great importance when Ludwig went to Rome; of course the echoes of Ockham and Marsilius of Padua are to be recognised in the texts that justified in 1338 an emperorship by the grace of the electors. But does this sufficiently explain the maintenance of the 'Hofakademie'; a maintenance that even stood in the way of the reconciliation with the papacy?

The change in imperial position and behaviour might very well have inspired Ludwig the Bavarian to place the foundation of the first university north of the Alps on his secret agenda. For this purpose he needed men nursed and fostered in the academic climate; men of fame and of experience, who had been rector, like Marsilius in Paris (1312-13), or who had taught in Oxford, like Ockham. In fact the mentioning of their merits as 'professors' in 1336 might be an echo of this intention. The crucial element lacking was papal approval and the formal act of foundation confirmed by his seal. Although universities could grow from different roots, it is clear that the foundations during the fourteenth century follow the general rule, that a combined princely and papal legitimation was necessary.<sup>68</sup> Since the short period of Ludwig's antipope had ended with the latter's resignation in 1330, the only way to acquire a legal basis for a university was by an ecclesiastical confirmation, given by the pope in Avignon. Although one might argue that the struggle with the papacy may have made it easier for Ludwig to neglect the required papal consent, Ludwig seems to have preferred not to provoke problems outside the immediate range of the legitimacy of his own position as an emperor. Moreover, the theological differences between the most prominent scholars and the papacy were too large to be neglected. With every failure of a reconciliation, hopes must have diminished, but at the same time emperor and scholars became increasingly dependent on each other.

These reflections help to explain one of the first actions of Charles IV, when he became the only king of the Empire after Ludwig's

---

<sup>68</sup> Rexroth, *Universitätsstiftungen* (as in n.16).

death: the foundation of the university of Prague in 1348. Charles made the dream of an imperial German centre of learning come true, and he thus exceeded his predecessor, who never managed to secure the support required for his position. One can be sure that Raban Sāwmā, had he come to Europe around 1360, would have visited this later *Amprōr King of Kings*, who understood the value of scholarship so well.

## THE RECLUSORIUM AS AN INFORMAL CENTRE OF LEARNING

ANNEKE B. MULDER-BAKKER

Aelred of Rievaulx, the twelfth-century Cistercian abbot in Northern England, writing to his sister, an anchoress, gave her this counsel:

Never allow young boys and girls to enter [into your anchorage]. There are female recluses who engage in teaching girls and turn their cells into classrooms. Such a recluse sits at her window, the youngsters stay in the porch. She notices every single motion among the youthful, now getting angry, now laughing, now threatening, now flattering, now slapping, now kissing; she calls closer to herself any girl weeping after being chastised, she caresses her face, putting her arms around her neck, and she falls into her arms, calls her daughter, or little friend.<sup>1</sup>

An earnest recluse, he warns, does not occupy herself with these kinds of worldly things; rather, she will remain silent and grave.

Aelred's vivid sketch of an anchorage turning into a classroom and a recluse becoming a teacher, may be set beside similar cases on the Continent. Ivetta of Huy, who lived in the early thirteenth century as a recluse in what is nowadays Belgium, was said to have had pupils of all ages and of both sexes commended to her for their education and religious training; half a dozen are mentioned individually and there were numerous anonymous ones besides. Even on her deathbed she worried so much about them, that she neglected her own prayers on their behalf and was kept busy: "as a mother with her daughters, a teacher with her pupils, *magistra cum discipulis*".<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Aelredi Rievallensis, *De Institutione Inclusarum*, in: A. Hoste, C.H. Talbot (eds.), *Aelredi Rievallensis, Opera Omnia*, CCCM 1 (Turnhout 1971) 640-641: *Pueris et puellis nullum ad te concedas accessum. Sunt quaedam inclusae quae docendis puellis occupantur, et cellam suam uertunt in scholam. Illa sedet ad fenestram, istae in porticu resident. Illa intuetur singulas, et inter puellares motus, nunc irascitur, nunc ridet, nunc minatur, nunc blanditur, nunc percutit, nunc osculatur, nunc flentem pro uerbere uocat proprius, palpat faciem, stringit collum, et in amplexum ruens, nunc filiam uocat, nunc amicam.*

<sup>2</sup> *Vita de beata Juetta sive Jutta*, written by Hugh of Floreffe and edited in AASS 13. Ianuarii (3d ed. Brussels 1863) 2, 157 (par.60): *adjunxit se ei religiosa quaedam mulier ac timens Deum, Margareta nomine, et alii quidam promiscui sexus et aetatis, viri et feminae, cupientes sanctissimae mulieris institui disciplinis; among whom, besides Margaret, another recluse is mentioned and: Alteram quoque puellam, quam secum ex eodem*



One might also adduce the case of Hildegard of Bingen, of whom it was said: "she never learned anything, except the psalter, as noble ladies were wont to do."<sup>3</sup> This she learned before her entrance into the anchorage at the age of seven. As an adult she proved to be well acquainted with Latin and classical literature, as well as with medicine and natural history and she had a good knowledge of the Bible and the Church Fathers. She apparently had learned these things in the reclusorium, under the guidance of her aunt and companion recluse, Jutta. When she was to take over the lead after Jutta's death, so many women were found to live with them that an independent women's convent could be founded. This shows that the education in the reclusorium had reached other young ladies as well.

Elsewhere we come across pairs of recluses and close friends such as Eve of Liège and Juliana of Cornillon,<sup>4</sup> Mary of Oignies and the anchoress Hedwig,<sup>5</sup> Alijt Bake and the Utrecht recluse,<sup>6</sup> teaching and edifying each other in similar ways.

---

*oppido oriundam nutrierat ab infantia.* Another girl is mentioned, 159 (par.72): *Fuit sane inter alias virgines, quas ipsa Christo educabat, virgo quaedam juvencula, quam prae ceteris unice diligebat, instruebat, et exhortabatur, eo quod in specialem filiam ab annis eam infantiae jam dudum adoptaverat.* Ivetta on her deathbed, 166 (par.114): *aliquantulum etiam orationibus et psalmis parcere videbatur ut frequentius eis [the sisters in the convent] colloqueretur et plenius disciplina instrueret Christi: nunc privatim, nunc publice, nunc particulariter singulas, nunc simul omnes castigans, admonens, et confortans, exhortabatur, ut nihil eis in virtutum consummatione deesset. . . ; 166 (par.115): *Sic se habente cum filiabus matre, magistra cum discipulis. . . .**

<sup>3</sup> I.M. Lappenberg (ed.), *Annales Stadenses auctore Alberto*, in: MGH SS 16, 330: *cum tamen nichil unquam didicerit, nisi solum psalterium more nobilium puellarum.* See S. Flanagan, *Hildegard of Bingen, 1098-1179: A Visionary Life* (London 1989).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Vita Julianae Cornillon*, in: AASS 5 April. (3d. ed. Paris/Rome 1866) 1, 443 (par. 2): *Juliana of Cornillon, the intimate friend of the recluse Eve of Liège acquired her knowledge: . . . sub Sapientia earum [the little Juliana and her sister] nutrice pariter et magistra. Ipsa namque illarum pascebat corpora sicut nutrix, reficiebat et mentes ut magistra, tradendo legem vitae et disciplinae. . . ; (par.3): Juliana: non solum psalterium legere sciret, sed etiam cordetenus retineret. Quae cum jam omnem scripturam Latinam et Gallicam [the Scriptures in the vernacular?] libere legere didicisset, libros B. Augustini multo affecto legebat. . . . Verum quoniam scripta beatissimi Bernardi. . . et plusquam viginti sermones extremae partis, editos ab eodem super Cantica Canticorum. . . studiose cordetenus didicit, et firmas memoriae commendavit.* This Juliana, 450 (par.23): *. . . cum ipsa Reclusa [Eva] de salutaribus et spiritualibus colloquiis conferebat.*

<sup>5</sup> *Vita Mariae Oigniacensis*, in: AASS 23 Junii (3d ed. Rome 1867) 5, 565 (par.80): *Cum autem familiaris esset cujusdam bonae et sanctae juvenculae, Heldevidis nomine, quae erat inclusa apud Willambrouck, quam valde diligebat, et velut mater filiam in Domino nutriebat fere per annos duodecim.*

<sup>6</sup> Cf. R. Lievens, "Alijt Bake van Utrecht", *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 42 (1957-1958) 127-151.

Such facts prompt one to enquire what the significance of this evidence can be. Is it just proof of incidental instruction by an inspired anchoress or is it more? And if the latter, is one justified in considering the anchorage as being a more continuous centre of instruction and (informal) learning, the link in a long and existing chain of tradition? Is there evidence from schools, textbooks or study guides pointing in that direction, indicating the knowledge that a recluse was supposed to have and would pass down to her, or his, disciples?

If this is the case, should we further imagine these schools as a kind of internal school, like those which monasteries and convents used to have, where young novices were trained by older monks or nuns to learn the profession? This is how we usually tend to interpret the evidence, the old recluse transmitting her knowledge to her servant and subsequent successor. Or is it better to understand the anchorage as an external school, a cultural and educational centre for the faithful in town? Might there even have been a more or less consistent group of followers around the recluse, with their own group culture, their own devotion and religious habits, a non-formal, non-academic, popular culture, possibly even deviant from the official Church? All these are questions and putative interpretations. In view of the great difficulty in deciding the issue, I have opted, in the following paragraphs, to give a sketch of the life of *one* such recluse, Margaret the Lane, and to give some circumstantial evidence that might support the last-mentioned and most far-reaching interpretation.

In the course of my work on anchorites and recluses in the Low Countries, I discovered a Middle-Dutch Life of the so-called Kreupel Margriet (Margaret the Lane)—a remarkable life for several reasons. Over the years other testimonies of her life came to light, both in Latin and in the vernacular, and Schmidt, who recently edited the Latin Life, gathered even more. At the present time fourteen manuscripts and almost as many versions are known to me—an amazing number for a saint's life which the *Acta Sanctorum* only mentions among the *praetermissi* and which modern research did not think worth noticing; it is even more remarkable if we consider the content of the *vita*, and the fact that all manuscripts (of which we know the provenance) seem to come from the Low Countries and adjacent territories.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> P.G. Schmidt (ed.), *Die Vita der Margareta contracta, einer Magdeburger Rekluse des*

Margaret the Lane appears to have been a recluse in Magdeburg, Germany, in the first half of the thirteenth century. She lived in an anchorage in the heart of town, with people around her in a kind of hospice—just like Ivetta of Huy. She gained many followers, as well as many critics, who caused her violent transfer to a cloister in the suburbs. On her own account, Margaret was educated by Christ and His Mother, who was given her as a special *doctrinx* (c.3). In innumerable inner conversations and visions Christ and His Mother taught her every theological, devotional and spiritual doctrine she had wanted to know. When we read the results thereof in the *vita*—dozens of pages with spiritual lore—we recognize reflections on passages of the Bible, as they were read during Mass and the Hours, reminiscences of theological discussions which she may have had with her Dominican confessor and other visitors, or reflections on authors whose works she possibly read herself. She was a rather well-informed, even somewhat learned woman. As with Hildegard of Bingen and other female religious, she may have lacked formal training in school, but she probably did substantial reading in her cell and listened attentively to preachers and visitors. These women called themselves *indoctae*, *illiteratae*; indeed, they attributed their knowledge not to themselves but to insights from above, but that is not to say they were not knowledgeable.<sup>8</sup> For the faithful in town, they might even have seemed more knowledgeable than the priests, who gathered information (only) from books, whereas they got it by infusion from God Himself. It is a different kind of learning, though, from that of the theologians in the schools.<sup>9</sup>

---

13. *Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg 1992). Besides the ten manuscripts mentioned by Schmidt I use ms. K.B. The Hague 73 H 11, f. 244r-256r, ms. Gemeentebibliotheek Rotterdam 96 D 9, f.111-116, ms. Staatsbibliothek Berlin Mg. qu. 191, f.244r-256r and ms. Archivum Capucinatorum Prov. Flandro-Belgicae in Antwerp, V 149; see my forthcoming: "Funktionen einer mittelalterlichen Einsiedlerin. Der Fall Margaretha von Magdeburg", to appear in *Mediaevistik* 7 (1994).

<sup>8</sup> Hildegard herself wrote: *Scio enim in textu interiorum intelligentiam expositionis Psalterii et Evangelii et aliorum voluminum. . . ; non docet [Spiritus] me litteras in Teutonica lingua, quas nescio, sed tantum scio in simplicitate legere, non in absisione textus*; see L. van Acker (ed.), *Hildegardis Bingensis, Epistolarium*, CCCM 91 (Turnhout 1991) 1, 3-5.

<sup>9</sup> This type of knowledge appears to be termed *cognitio* and not *scientia*, see Schmidt, *Vita* (as in n.7) 90: *Proprie fragilitatis cognitio et Dei cognitio istam humiliaverunt, et non solum ista, sed et cognitio cognitionis, videlicet quod Deus dederat ei scire, quod habuit istorum cognitionem*. The same term *cognitio* is used for Margaret of Ypres' knowledge, see G. Meersseman, "Les Frères Prêcheurs et le Mouvement dévot en Flandre au xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle", *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 18 (1948) 121.

Be this as it may, these women considered it their God-given task to transmit their knowledge to the faithful in town. Margaret the Lame could always be applied to when people wanted her to give good advice and some comfort, or wanted to discuss with her religious matters.<sup>10</sup> She often took the initiative herself. As the Middle Dutch *vita* puts it:

She often summoned public sinners before her and expended her energies on them. She tired herself out for them... She shared in everybody's pains and sorrows. She shared in everybody's happiness.<sup>11</sup>

Was it just moral exhortation that Margaret and the other recluses provided? The clerical biographers create that impression, but it seems to me that they have consistently played down the roles of the recluses. There is circumstantial evidence pointing in that direction.

As is known, the Low Countries, and Northern Europe in general, saw rapid social and economic changes in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. New techniques in agriculture were developed, the growth of a cloth industry, long distance trade and the rise of towns brought prosperity and all sorts of social and cultural changes. Christianity, the actual Christian belief, entered daily life and started to dominate devotional practice: "la conversion en profondeur," as Milis was aptly to term the process.<sup>12</sup> The urban inhabitants, the merchants and craftsmen, the aristocracy, who had learned to make a good living, had time and energy now to seek the meaning of life, to contemplate eternal things,<sup>13</sup> and they looked for good spiritual guidance: a guidance most of the ordinary clergymen were not capable of giving. It is well known that the mendicants tried to fill this gap, but it is my belief that devout Beguines and holy

---

<sup>10</sup> ms. K.B. The Hague 73 H 11, f. 243-4: "Ende hoer dochte somtijt dat si also grote wijsheit had, al hadden alle die bedructe herten van der werelt voer hoer gheweest, si wolde se al wel ghetroest hebben ende een iegheliken nae sinen staet."

<sup>11</sup> ms. K.B. The Hague 73 H 11, f. 235: "Ende dicwile riep si bi hoer grote openbaer sunderen ende versleet daer ouer al hoer crachten. Ende maecte hoer seluen ten utersten moede daer ouer... Alre menschen druc ende elleynde was si deelechtig. Alre menschen vroude ende blijtschap was si deelechtich."

<sup>12</sup> L. Milis, "La conversion en profondeur: un procès sans fin", *Revue du Nord* 68 (1986) 487-498.

<sup>13</sup> K. Bosl, "Laienfrömmigkeit und religiöse Bewegung in der Spannung zwischen Orthodoxie und Häresie im europäischen 12. Jahrhundert", in: idem, *Historia Magistra. Die geschichtliche Dimension der Bildung*, ed. by H. Freilinger (München 1988) 86-113.

women, the *mulieres sanctae* of the sources, did so as well.<sup>14</sup> According to modern scholarship,<sup>15</sup> these women saw the social and economic neediness of their fellow citizens and started to alleviate it by caring for the poor and opening hospitals for the sick and needy, as Lame Margaret and Ivetta of Huy were said to have done. Besides this, the anchoresses seem also to have tried to meet the intellectual and spiritual needs: they felt urged to transmit the knowledge they had gathered. And they could feel encouraged by the Church, which urged the faithful to teach each other a pious way of life.<sup>16</sup> If Margaret's *vita*, as we have it, gives us a good idea of her method, we recognise the kind of information with which she provided the faithful—namely, the three pains of Christ, the five qualities of a good prayer, the seven pains of Hell, the ten mercies of God: in short, the lists and recitals of facts, that people without formal education love to hear.<sup>17</sup>

We may gather that the recluses were rather successful. Where the priesthood often lacked the trust and confidence of the people, these ascetics were seen as God's special messengers. The faithful saw the visible signs thereof: the infused wisdom, the ecstasies and visions, the 'insider' knowledge of the hidden sins of fellowmen, the prophetic gifts. To a greater extent than ordained clergymen, who only administered God's Word in a technical sense, they were the inspired administrators of God's living Word and enjoyed charismatic, God-given authority. The moving example of Hermannus, the Jew from Cologne is good proof of this. In his autobiography he tells us that he had long hesitated about converting to Christendom. He then asked for the support and intercession with God of the recluses of Cologne. They gave him the confidence he so dearly needed. It was not the reasoning about the Cristian faith nor the

---

<sup>14</sup> B.M. Bolton, "*Mulieres sanctae*", in: S.M. Stuard (ed.), *Women in Medieval Society* (Philadelphia 1976) 141-159.

<sup>15</sup> Besides Bolton (as in preceding note), A. Mens, *Oorsprong en betekenis van de Nederlandse Begijnen—en Begardenbeweging* (Antwerp 1947); E.W. McDonnell, *The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture* (New Brunswick 1954); T. Renna, "Hagiography and Feminine Spirituality in the Low Countries", *Cîteaux* 39 (1988) 285-296.

<sup>16</sup> P.C. Boeren, "Les plus anciens Statuts du diocèse de Cambrai", *Revue de droit canonique* 4 (1954) 133.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. J. Goody, *The Interface between the Written and the Oral* (Cambridge 1987) 258-289.

discussions with clerics that persuaded him but the devout prayers and consultations of the simple lay recluses.<sup>18</sup>

These women were in a position of authority in the town, they were central figures in the group of faithful around them. Charismatic power was attributed to them because they appeared to be not mere ascetics praying to the Lord above, but mediators between the Lord and the faithful around. They had an open eye, they made investments, so to speak,<sup>19</sup> in social relations: they tied people together, inspired and uplifted them. They were in a position not only to give moral advice, but all sorts of spiritual and theological information, not to mention medical, political and economic knowledge. If we pursue Caroline Walker Bynum's line of thought, who applied Troeltsch's socio-religious categories to medieval mystics, we can recognise here "freie christliche Gruppierungen um religiöse Virtuosen"—study groups or intimate personal circles around recluses.<sup>20</sup> Thanks to their own lay background these recluses were capable of giving the information that people needed in formats which the latter could understand: lists and recitals of facts, short stories and examples of saints' lives, visions and inner conversations transmitting factual information. For this reason one may well believe that these *mulieres sanctae* played a more important role in society than scholars wish one to believe.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> G. Niemeyer (ed.), *Hermannus quondam Judaeus opusculum De Conversione sua*, in: MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 4 (Weimar 1963) 107-108: *Cogitanti itaque mihi, cuius me potissimum orationibus velut maioris apud Deum meriti commendarem, duarum sororum occurrit memoria, que apud Coloniensem civitatem iuxta beati Mauricii monasterium pro Deo incluse celibem simul vitam ducebant quarum sancta conversatio suavissimum bone opinionis odorem per totam civitatis illius diffuderat viciniam. Harum patrocinis me sperans plurimum posse apud Deum adiuvari, ad ipsas omni cum festinatione perrexi eisque, quantis temptationum stimulis perurgerer, multis cum lacrimis aperui, et ut pro mea illuminatione suas ad Deum preces dirigere dignarentur, suppliciter exoravi. . . Ecce enim me, quem ad fidem Christi nec reddita mihi a multis de ea ratio nec magnorum potuit clericorum convertere disputatio, devota simplicium feminarum attraxit oratio.*

<sup>19</sup> I borrow this term from G. Klaniczay, *The Uses of Supernatural Power. The Transformation of Popular Religion in Medieval and Early-Modern Europe* (Princeton 1990) 6.

<sup>20</sup> C. Walker Bynum, "The Mysticism and Asceticism of Medieval Women: Some Comments on the Typologies of Max Weber and Ernst Troeltsch", in: idem, *Fragmentation and Redemption. Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York 1992) 65.

<sup>21</sup> In this belief I feel supported by G. Signori's short inventory "Ohnmacht des Körpers—Macht der Sprache. Reklusion als Ordensalternative und Handlungsspielraum für Frauen", in: R. Ludi et al. (eds.), *Frauen zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand. Beiträge der 5. Schweizerischen Historikerinnentagung* (Zürich 1990) 25-42.

There is further circumstantial evidence to be taken into account. In recent years a debate has started on the inner motivations of religious women (among them the recluses) in the later Middle Ages. Most scholars hold that these were merely devout women striving for a life outside society, in a monastery or convent, but forced to accept a reclusorium or a Beguinage for lack of places in these convents; willy-nilly these women were led to live an original and sometimes deviant way of life. Against these views, however, one could place that of Kaspar Elm, who considers such women to be a distinct category of religious, beside clergy and monks, following the so-called *via media*. He sees them as faithful women, who positively wanted to live an extra-regular devout life, or better, a non-regular, non-professed way of religious life, within society, and with an open eye for the needs of fellow Christians. In this they were like the Wanderprediger, the Beguines and the Brethren of the Common Life, all of which movements had their centre in the Low Countries.<sup>22</sup> He wonders whether these groups were just incidental groupings, or whether, because of their continuous existence in the Low Countries, they might not have formed a more regular, though not institutionalised, movement. This would have been a movement, then, inspired by charismatic leaders and the example of the apostles and holy virgins of the Early Church—such as Mary Magdalen, who, according to her medieval legend, preached in France, christianised the French and ended up as an anchoress in Burgundy. The recluse Ivetta of Huy, by the way, considered herself a second Magdalen, as did other charismatic women.

This line of argument leads one to wonder whether in the later Middle Ages this *via media* might have found a place of support, an anchor, so to say, in the urban centres of the anchorages—filled as these were with recluses and the groups of followers around them. In that case, the recluses could be seen as links in the chain of tradition, transmitting the *via media* to successors and other followers, instructing the faithful and passing down the information they had gathered. They could do this both orally and in writing: the inquisitor Guibert of Tournai, in 1274, complains about women, ‘the so-called Beguines’—whether this is to be understood as Beguines in a

---

<sup>22</sup> K. Elm, “Die Stellung der Frau in Ordenswesen, Semireligiosentum und Häresie zur Zeit der heiligen Elisabeth”, in: *Sankt Elisabeth, Fürstin, Dienerin, Heilige* (Sigmaringen 1981) 7-28.

strict sense or as *via media* adepts in a broader sense, including recluses, is not clear<sup>23</sup>—who dare to interpret the Holy Scriptures and have them translated into French. They even have them copied and distributed on the book market in Paris. They read these books together in their conventicles, their houses and in the streets.<sup>24</sup> Here we have proof that religious women taught and distributed books. In the case of Margaret the Lame, we can observe that she inspired her confessor to write a *vita* that contained the same kind of information. Such *vitae*, too, could be used as a kind of textbook, an aid for teaching by illustration: for that is what Margaret's *vita* seems to be, a teaching aid for recluses and other faithful in the later Middle Ages.

This interpretation may be said to gain support from the amazing number of manuscripts and from the character of some of them. The Brussels codex includes, for example, besides *vitae*, short treatises and lists and memorisations for the faithful.<sup>25</sup> The testimony of someone like Alijt Bake is further proof hereof. Alijt, the devout prioress of a Modern Devotion convent, was educated by a recluse and felt inspired by Lame Margaret's Life. S. Machtildis [of Magdeburg?], Lame Margaret and Catherine of Siena, she said:

seem to have left the contemplative life and entered active life. That is why their life seems less perfect on the outside, but it is much more perfect on the inside.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Elsewhere in his accusation Guibert talks about: *mulieres aliae* [other than nuns], *de quibus nescimus, utrum debeamus eas vel saeculares vel moniales appellare. Partim enim utuntur ritu saeculari, partim etiam regulari*; clearly *via media* adepts, therefore. It is my opinion that Guibert uses the term Beguines in this broader sense—as many authors did in this early period of the Beguine movement; see A. Stroïc, "Collectio de Scandalis Ecclesiae. Nova editio", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 24 (1931) 58.

<sup>24</sup> *Sunt apud nos mulieres, quae Beghine vocantur, et quaedam earum subtilitatibus vigent et novitatibus gaudent. Habent interpretata scripturarum mysteria et in communi idiomate gallicata, quae tamen in sacra Scriptura exercitatis vix sunt pervia. Legunt ea communiter, irreverenter, audaciter, in conventiculis, in ergastulis, in plateis. Vidi ego, legi et habui bibliam gallicatam, cuius exemplar Parisiis publice ponitur a stationariis ad scribendum haereses et errores, dubietates et incocinnas interpretationes. Quae continentur in talibus, chartae non capit exiguitas, immo vix prolixitas, et aurium capacitas inspurcata cum sobrietate vix audit. Si morbus invaluerit, tot surgent scandala quod auditores, tot blasphemiae quot plateae.* See Stroïc, *Collectio de Scandalis* (as in n.23) 61.

<sup>25</sup> Such as *De 12 fructibus sacramenti* or *Versus de sacramento*; see A. Ampe, "Een oud florilegium eucharisticum in een 14e-eeuws handschrift", *Ons Geestelijk Erf* 31 (1957) 301-324, 32 (1958) 57-75, and 38 (1964) 23-55.

<sup>26</sup> B. Spaapen, "Middeleeuwse Passiemystiek", *Ons Geestelijk Erf* 42 (1968)



Alijt imitated their example.

In his famous essay "The Christian Middle Ages", John van Engen wrote:

The whole inner dynamic [of the later Middle Ages] was for the laity to acquire parts of the priestly sacred culture . . .

Everywhere he discerns the

efforts of medieval folk to go beyond baptism, implicit faith, and days of obligation to acquire for themselves what ordained holy men, at whatever level, possessed as a privilege and maintained as a duty.<sup>27</sup>

As evidence, he lists some options the laity had. Another dimension, I believe, may be added to his account: the example of recluses such as Margaret the Lame, teaching and inspiring the faithful from behind their windows as links in a long chain of *via media* adepts, intermediaries between ecclesiastical learning and lay culture; with their *vitae* as a written, but not bookish, source of information.

---

399: "...scinnen dat scouwende leven ghelaten te hebben ende sijn in dat werkende leven ghetorden. Ende hierom scijnt haer leven vele min volmaect van buten, maer het es vele volmaecter van binnen."

<sup>27</sup> J. van Engen, "The Christian Middle Ages", *American Historical Review* 91 (1986) 547.

## JOHN BROMYARD AND THE HEREFORD DOMINICANS

PETER BINKLEY

A Dominican priory was always intended, from the foundation of the order, to be a centre of learning. No new convent was to be founded without a qualified lector, who was to lecture regularly on theology for the benefit both of the friars and others. The convent was to have a working library for the use of the friars in preparing their sermons and in exercising those aspects of the pastoral care that were open to them. This learning was to be directed to one aim: making the friars useful to others for the salvation of their souls. In his letter to novices, the thirteenth-century theologian and English Prior Provincial Robert Kilwardby (later Archbishop of Canterbury) set out the ideal:

[Y]ou should notice the usefulness of our state of life, my beloved novices. In this, unless I am mistaken, our state of life ought, on any true calculation, to be preferred to all others. For all our Chapters and discussions and debates and all the Order's study aim at nothing else than to prepare people and make them fit for the salvation of souls, and, when they are prepared and equipped in their way of life and in knowledge, to direct them to the task of converting sinners. So I reckon that no other Order works as hard in its concern for this as ours does, or achieves so much by its work.<sup>1</sup>

These brave words set a very high standard. It is not altogether surprising that Kilwardby's letter survives only because it was quoted almost complete by the Franciscan Archbishop Pecham in his rebuttal of it. In this paper I should like to describe how a particular priory attempted to live up to this ideal of usefulness under difficult circumstances. For the first seventy-five years after its foundation in the mid-1240s, the Dominican community in Hereford had to struggle for its very survival as an institution; yet within a very few years of their achieving a secure foothold in the city in 1322, one of their members, John Bromyard, was busy producing what is surely

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Tugwell (ed. and tr.), *Early Dominicans: Selected Writings* (New York 1982) 150.

the largest English collection of preaching aids to flow from a single pen in the fourteenth century. I should like to argue that his work as a compiler was prompted by the needs of the Hereford Dominicans for help in composing sermons, in the absence of a well-developed priory library.

John Bromyard is best known to modern scholars for his *Summa praedicatorum*, mainly through the books of G.R. Owst on English sermon literature in the later Middle Ages.<sup>2</sup> But three other works from Bromyard's pen survive, which have received little attention; and another five works are lost. There exists no full description of the canon of his works, so a brief summary is in order. Our best guide to his works is the sixteenth-century Dominican chronicler Alberto da Castello, who attributes eight works to Bromyard; of these two have survived (the *Summa praedicatorum* and the *Tractatus iuris*), one can tentatively be identified with a surviving work (the *Distinctiones*, probably corresponding to one of the two sets of sermons mentioned by da Castello), and the other five are lost but their existence is confirmed by references in surviving works (*Sermones*, *Collationes*, *Additiones*, *Registrum*, and *Persuasiones*).<sup>3</sup> One work unknown to da Castello also survives (the *Exhortationes*), bringing the number of surviving works to four.

Bromyard's principal work, the *Summa praedicatorum* (written in the second quarter of the fourteenth century)<sup>4</sup> is aptly described as an encyclopaedia for preachers. It contains 198 chapters on topics suitable for sermons, arranged alphabetically. Most of the capital sins and cardinal virtues are treated, with many of their subdivisions, as well as theological topics such as angels and free will, and topics suitable for moral discussion such as war, cities, and

---

<sup>2</sup> G.R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England: An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period c. 1350-1450* (Cambridge 1926); idem, *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England: A Neglected Chapter in the History of English Letters & of the English People* (New York 1961, 2nd ed.).

<sup>3</sup> *Fr. Ioannes Bromiord, anglicus, scripsit summam predicantium maximi precii. Item sermones optimos de tempore et de sanctis per totum annum. Item librum qui dicitur collationes eiusdem. Item alium qui dicitur additiones eiusdem. Item alium qui dicitur registrum eiusdem. Item alium qui dicitur persuasiones eiusdem. Item tractatum per alphabetum qui dicitur tractatus iuris eiusdem. Item sermones de tempore et de sanctis.* R. Creytens, "Les écrivains dominicains dans la Chronique d'Albert de Castello", *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 30 (1960) 270.

<sup>4</sup> L.E. Boyle, "The Date of the *Summa Praedicatorum* of John Bromyard", *Speculum* 48 (1973) 533-537; repr. in: idem, *Pastoral Care, Clerical Education and Canon Law, 1200-1400* (London 1981) X.

merchants. The *Summa* is written generally in the mode of a preacher, and a fervent one (Bromyard recommends the invective mode when preaching),<sup>5</sup> though its construction is rather dense. The reader was expected to select the material he needed and fill it out with thoughts of his own. In a pinch, though, sections of text could be extracted from the *Summa* and inserted virtually unchanged into a sermon, and indeed that is how it was used by its earliest known reader, bishop Sheppey.<sup>6</sup> The text is composed perhaps half of Bromyard's own argumentation, and half of authorities cited in support. These authorities are generally quoted with precise reference to the source, so that readers could easily look up the original context if they wished. About two-thirds of his citations are of Scripture—not surprisingly, given the Bible-based preaching style of the Dominicans. The others are drawn from the Church fathers, scholastic theologians, classical authors, and especially canon and civil law sources. Bromyard used Gratian's *Decretum* as a florilegium of the Fathers; many of his Patristic quotations can be traced to the *Decretum*, even when he does not explicitly name it as his source. He makes much use of exempla or moral tales, although the *Summa* is far from being a simple collection of exempla, as it has sometimes been described. Other materials include fables and natural history. Much of the argumentation is intensely polemical, but not generally individual: any moral friar would express himself as pungently on the same topics.

Our present interest in the *Summa* is in its earliest users. There is evidence that the *Summa* was in use by the friars at Hereford while it was still under revision. In the prologue, Bromyard warns that a copy was made before he had made his final revisions. The wording is significant: "the copy (*exemplatum*) made from this one (*ab isto*) before it was finished or corrected differs in many places, and especially in the first letter 'a', in the division of the following chapters and in the marginal notation of articles."<sup>7</sup> There were two copies, then,

---

<sup>5</sup> John Bromyard, *Summa praedicantium* (London, British Library, Royal MS 7.E.IV) P.12, art. 8.

<sup>6</sup> G. Mifsud, *John Sheppey, Bishop of Rochester, as Preacher and Collector of Sermons*, B.Litt. thesis (Oxford 1953) 226ff.; C. von Nolcken, "Some Alphabetical Compendia and How Preachers Used Them in Fourteenth-Century England", *Viator* 12 (1981) 277-278.

<sup>7</sup> Bromyard, *Summa* (as in n.5) Prol. 7: *exemplatum ab isto acceptum antequam esset factum vel correctum, in multis, et specialiter in prima litera "a", sequencium discrepat capitulorum distinctione et exteriori articulorum annotatione.*

differing not only in the text but especially in the divisions of the text, so that a citation of chapter and section based on one copy would not work in the other. These two copies must have been in use by the same people, or the differences in citations would not present a problem. It seems clear they were both in the Hereford priory, and that as Bromyard's work progressed the demand for it among his *confrères* was so great that a copy was made to facilitate consultation. The note just quoted must have been added to the authentic copy, and a corresponding note would presumably have been inserted into the other copy. What became of the other copy is unknown; none of the surviving manuscripts of the *Summa* is descended from it.

A brief description must suffice for Bromyard's other surviving works. The *Tractatus iuris* (usually known as the *Opus trivium*, a title given it in later German manuscripts and in the incunabula) uses the same structure of alphabetical chapters and paragraphs as the *Summa*, with which it also shares material.<sup>8</sup> But it is a very different work. Its purpose was to make the riches of the authoritative canon law collections of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries more easily accessible to the preacher: to mine the legal texts not for their juridical but for their moral content, making technical legal matters relevant to the everyday moral concerns of the preacher by analogy or allegory. In contrast to the *Summa* and the *Tractatus*, the other two surviving works are collections of sermon outlines arranged for the liturgical year. The *Distinctiones* contain the *temporale* and *sanctorale* cycles, the *Exhortationes* only the *temporale*.<sup>9</sup> The contents have the structure of university sermons, with theme and divisions, but without prothemes, and only sketchy development. A preacher could draw his theme and structure from them, and find the basic material for his sermon; but he would have to make a selection of the material and augment it with his own development. The material provided is mainly Bromyard's own argumentation, studded with scriptural quotations; there are far fewer Patristic and other authorities than in the *Summa*.

There are occasional cross-references from one work to another. The *Summa* frequently invokes the now lost *Sermones*, and was provided in its later revisions with references to the now lost *Collationes*

---

<sup>8</sup> I have used London, British Library, Royal MS 10.C.x.

<sup>9</sup> *Distinctiones*: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley MS 859, fol. 44r-226v; *Exhortationes*: Cambridge University Library, MS Kk.iv.24, fol. 1r-120v.

and *Additiones*.<sup>10</sup> The *Distinctiones* probably refer to the now lost *Registrum*. The *Exhortationes* contain two references to the *Summa*, four to the *Distinctiones*, as well as probable references to the lost *Sermones* and *Persuasiones*.<sup>11</sup> The *Tractatus* stands apart: as far as I have found, it neither quotes nor is quoted. Apart from a note at the end of the prologue of the *Summa*, that there are frequent references to similar material in the *Sermones*, I have not found in any of the works an explicit discussion of the others. All we find are the citations, with the title generally abbreviated to the first syllable. It is only from Alberto da Castello's catalogue that we know what the abbreviations 'Ad' and 'Re' stood for.

Bromyard's output was prodigious. The *Summa* contains close to a million words. The total of the surviving works is roughly 1.75 million; if the lost works were on the same scale as the *Distinctiones* and *Exhortationes* (which by their reference system they seem to resemble), Bromyard's writings must have totalled between 2.5 and 3 million words. Yet the circumstances under which John Bromyard produced this impressive body of work were not promising.

The history of the establishment of the Hereford priory has been sketched several times, most recently by Nigel Yates, with the aid of newly catalogued documents from the Cathedral archives.<sup>12</sup> The house was established with a grant of land shortly before 1246 from a commoner, Agnes Bysset, and confirmed by king Henry III. It was immediately opposed by the bishop, the dean and chapter, and the secular clergy, on the grounds that there were already enough charges on public charity in the city. The Dominican view of such resistance was expressed by Bromyard thus: "It is a marvelous

---

<sup>10</sup> Bromyard informs us in the prologue to the *Summa* that it is based on an earlier compilation, which he emended and added to, *ponendo certas materias sub determinatis literis secundum ordinem alphabeti, per propria capitula distinguendo*; Bromyard, *Summa* (as in n.5) Prol. 2. This earlier treatise has generally been thought to be the *Tractatus iuris civilis et canonici*, with which the *Summa* does indeed share some material; but the *Tractatus* was itself divided into chapters, and arranged in alphabetical order, in the same scheme as the *Summa*. It seems more likely that the earlier compilation was the lost *Sermones*.

<sup>11</sup> The *Exhortationes* appear therefore to be Bromyard's last work, which may account for their absence from Alberto da Castello's catalogue. For a list of the cross-references see the appendix below, 264.

<sup>12</sup> W.N. Yates, "The Attempts to Establish a Dominican Priory at Hereford, 1246-1342", *Downside Review* 87 (1969) 254-267; idem, "The Hereford Dominicans: An Unknown Document", *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 41 (1971) 157-173. See also W.A. Hinnebusch, *The Early English Friars Preachers* (Rome 1951) 109-113.

thing, that a great guardian of a city and flock will more willingly tolerate in the city a thousand usurers and as many prostitutes than twenty friars".<sup>13</sup> There followed a protracted legal battle, as the friars attempted to build a priory and were frustrated by their opponents, sometimes violently. The Dominicans were twice driven from their land, and their unfinished buildings destroyed. Appeal and counter-appeal to the Curia must have cost a small fortune to both parties. In the 1280s it seems that the Dominicans had succeeded in putting up houses and an oratory with a bell; they were attempting to build a priory and a church.<sup>14</sup> The expensive lawsuit apparently dragged on, though we have no more record of it until 1317, when the Pope ordered the Archbishop of Canterbury to resolve it. King Edward II played peacemaker, and in 1319 donated a new site, which was confirmed by the bishop in 1322. Only then, over seventy-five years after their first establishment, did the Hereford Dominicans have a secure foundation.

What was the state of the Hereford Dominican community at this time? Probably they were a small group, with meagre resources but great determination. They seem to have been an informal community, without a prior.<sup>15</sup> We have no evidence for their numbers in this period. Our best sources of prosopographical information, the ordination lists in the bishop's registers, are of no help before 1327, for until that year the bishops of Hereford did not ordinarily register ordinations. There is evidence that in 1325, three years after the confirmation of their new site, the Hereford Dominicans were not yet strong enough to serve the diocese. In this year eight Dominicans were given licences to hear confessions in the diocese.<sup>16</sup> This licence was required by the terms of the bull *Super cathedram* of Pope Boniface VIII, which attempted to resolve the longstanding dispute between the mendicants and the secular clergy by (among other things) allowing the friars to hear confessions only with a licence from the

---

<sup>13</sup> Bromyard, *Summa* (as in n.5) C.4.17: *Quod tamen mirabile est dictu, quod unus magnus civitatis et gregis custos tollerabilius sustinet in civitate mille usurarios et totidem meretrices quam xx fratres.*

<sup>14</sup> Yates, *Hereford Dominicans* (as in n.12) 165, 167.

<sup>15</sup> In the settlement document, they are led by the prior provincial, John of Bristol; none of the three Hereford friars named is assigned an office. They are simply *tunc Herefordie existentes*; W.W. Capes (ed.), *Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral* (Hereford 1908) 197.

<sup>16</sup> A.B. Emden, "Dominican Confessors and Preachers Licensed by Medieval English Bishops", *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 32 (1962) 191 (Heref. 6).

bishop.<sup>17</sup> At some point before 1321, the same eight names in the same order headed a list of licensees in the register of the bishop of Salisbury; and again in 1328, when the bishop of Salisbury performed a general renewal of licences, six of the original eight (still in the same order) stand at the head of a group of twenty-six licensees.<sup>18</sup> These eight men seem to have been sent from Salisbury as a team to help the Hereford friars establish themselves as preachers in the diocese.

But only a few years later Hereford was taking its place in the Dominican educational structure of the West Midlands. From 1327 on we have ordination lists for the diocese of Hereford, and a comparison of these with lists for the neighbouring dioceses of Coventry and Lichfield and Worcester reveals the typical Dominican pattern: frequent movement between houses of young friars in the course of their training, as represented by their progress through the minor and major orders.<sup>19</sup> Hereford sent some of its young men to nearby priories, and sometimes received friars for training as well. Through the 1330s and 1340s the priory was vigorous, to judge from the ordination lists. Thirty-one Dominicans were ordained to the priesthood by the Bishop of Hereford during this period, most of them no doubt from the Hereford convent.<sup>20</sup>

During the period of the compilation of the *Summa praedicatorum* Bromyard was attached to the Dominican convent in Hereford, and there is no reason to believe that he was not resident in Hereford for most of that time. On 1 February 1326 his name was presented to the bishop of Hereford for a *Super cathedram* licence to hear confessions; this, however, was deferred because Bromyard himself was absent. We do not know when the licence was finally granted. Bishop Orleton was occupied in the next several months with arrangements for the overthrow of King Edward II, and was translated to the see of Worcester early the following year. His successor in Hereford, Thomas Charlton (1327-1344), did not see fit to record

---

<sup>17</sup> A.G. Little, "Licence to Hear Confessions under the Bull *Super Cathedram*", in: idem, *Franciscan Papers, Lists, and Documents* (Manchester 1943) 217-229.

<sup>18</sup> Emden, *Dominican Confessors* (as in n.16) 200-202 (Salis. 3, 12)

<sup>19</sup> M. O'Carroll, "The Educational Organisation of the Dominicans in England and Wales 1221-1348: A Multidisciplinary Approach", *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 50 (1980) 23-62.

<sup>20</sup> These figures are based on A.B. Emden, *A Survey of Dominicans in England Based on the Ordination Lists in Episcopal Registers (1268-1538)* (Rome 1967) 103ff.



the granting of licences in his registers. But granted it was, for on 27 October 1352 friar William le Wyte received a licence from Bishop Trillek in Bromyard's place, probably after the latter's death.<sup>21</sup> Bromyard's career therefore coincides with the period of recovery and growth of the Hereford convent after the settlement of 1322. There is no reason to doubt that he was resident in Hereford for most of this period, despite his unexplained absence at the beginning of it. He may have travelled in Italy at some time in his life, as has been suggested, but English bishops were reluctant to grant *Super cathedram* licences in large numbers, and it is unlikely that the fledgling community would have wasted one on a man who would not be present to make use of it. Bromyard's *Distinctiones* include a sermon-outline for the feast of St Thomas Cantilupe, bishop of Hereford, who was canonised in 1320 and whose feast was not widely observed outside the diocese. When Bromyard tells anecdotes in the first person, they generally relate to the life of an itinerant preaching friar; he mentions, for example, Welsh customs and laws, which he must have encountered in western Herefordshire. Moreover, he claims extensive experience as a preacher; speaking of the English, he says: "there is scarcely found a Christian nation which so infrequently and unwillingly hears the word of God; 'experto crede magistro'—believe me, I know".<sup>22</sup> There is no reason to suppose that this experience was gained anywhere but in the diocese of Hereford.

Where did Bromyard find the books from which to compile his material? The priory library must have had at least some of the reference tools he would need.<sup>23</sup> Humbert of Romans listed the basic contents of a Dominican library: Bible with gloss, *Summae* on canon law, Peraldus on the virtues and vices, biblical concordances, *Decretum* and *Decretals*, and so on.<sup>24</sup> Whether the Hereford Dominicans had all of these may reasonably be doubted: certainly they

<sup>21</sup> For the two licences, see Emden, *Dominican Confessors* (as in n.16) 191-192.

<sup>22</sup> Bromyard, *Summa* (as in n.5) A.26.10: *vix invenitur nacio christiana que ita raro et invite audit verbum dei—experto crede magistro*.

<sup>23</sup> Only one surviving book from the library and one possibly from the chapel have been identified; see N.R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain* (London 1964, 2nd ed.) 100.

<sup>24</sup> Humbertus de Romanis, *Opera*, II 265, from L.E. Boyle, "Notes on the Education of the *Frates Communes* in the Dominican Order in the Thirteenth Century", *Xenii Medii Aevi Historiam Illustrantia oblata Thomae Kaeppli O.P.* (Rome 1978); repr. in: idem, *Pastoral Care* (as in n.4) VI.

cannot have collected much of a library before 1322, when their physical circumstances were so exiguous. Outside his own priory, Bromyard may have had access to the Franciscan convent, which had a head start of many years on the Dominicans and, more importantly, had a secure position from the beginning. Many of its books survive, and M.R. James, judging from their press-marks, estimated that the collection must have run to 300 volumes, quite a respectable size.<sup>25</sup> The Cathedral library, of course, then as now had a magnificent collection of twelfth-century bible and Patristic manuscripts, testifying to the bygone glory of its school; we may wonder, however, how easy of access they would have been to a Dominican, even after the resolution of the bitter lawsuit. There were other monastic libraries within reach of Hereford; the question is one of access. A Franciscan source, compiled a few years before Bromyard's work, gives us some insight into the possibilities of this access. This is the *Registrum Anglie*: a union catalogue of monastic libraries compiled by the Franciscans of Oxford from reports submitted by teams of friars from Franciscan convents around the country.<sup>26</sup> The Hereford team visited the Cathedral library and that of St. Guthlac's priory in the city, and four other priories in Herefordshire (including Wigmore), as well as Brecon across the border in Wales and Lanthony in Gloucestershire. The purpose of this work was to locate books for the use of the Franciscan custodial schools, either to borrow or to copy. The implication is that the monastic libraries were at least to some extent accessible to the friars.

The heavy preaching load of the friars, however, required easy access to material for sermons. For this reason, a priory with a deficient library could benefit most from a compiler like John Bromyard. To acquire a collection of *originalia* would be a long and expensive process; compilations like Bromyard's were the shortest route to a working library capable of supplying the preaching needs of the friars. Perhaps the other Hereford Dominicans collaborated in the work, contributing their own sermons and notes, in the spirit of the great Dominican collaborative projects such as the scriptural concordance. The casual cross-references from one work to another,

---

<sup>25</sup> M.R. James, "The Library of the Grey Friars of Hereford", in: A.G. Little, M.R. James, H.M. Bannister (eds.), *Collectanea Franciscana* (Aberdeen 1914) vol. 1, 114-123.

<sup>26</sup> R.H. Rouse, M.A. Rouse, R.A.B. Mynors (eds.), *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum* (London 1991).

and especially from the *Summa* to the lost works, suggests that they were kept together and used as one great resource.

In his chapter on avarice, Bromyard says that a particularly detestable variety is that tenacious avarice which refuses to share that which one can give without suffering loss: that is, knowledge. His example is the preacher who refuses to let another borrow his notebooks. Such a one may object that he risks embarrassment, if he preaches material that the borrower has already preached to the same audience. It should be answered that the merit he gains by charity is greater than the damage he suffers from humiliation.<sup>27</sup> Bromyard's own merit in this regard is almost unmatched; and perhaps the very volume of his material saved him from such embarrassment.

#### Appendix: References from one work to another

References to the lost works may be recognised by Bromyard's characteristic form of cross-reference within the surviving works: an abbreviation of the unit (e.g. "Ex." for the *Exhortationes*) followed by two numbers or a number and a letter, indicating item and paragraph. The *Summa*'s (as in n.5) references to the *Sermones* are indicated at the end of the prologue (§7): *frequenter sit missio ad sermones, tanquam ad materiam similem uel breuius ordinatam*. References to the *Sermones* (abbreviated "Ser.") are frequent in the chapters of 'A' (e.g. A.27.5) but diminish thereafter. References to the *Collationes* (generally abbreviated "Col." or "Coll.", but written in full at R.5.22, fol. 519rb) and *Additiones* ("Ad.") have been added *passim* by an early corrector (e.g. fol. 15rb: "Col. 45.15"; fol. 166va: "Ad. 7.14"), and have been incorporated in the text in Cambridge, Peterhouse MSS 24 and 25. I have found in the *Distinctiones* (as in n.9) one apparent reference to the *Registrum* ("Re."): Di. 22.f (fol. 80r). The *Exhortationes* (as in n.9) contain references to the *Summa*: Ex. 66.d (fol. 67ra), 66.h (fol. 68ra), and to the *Distinctiones*: Ex. 21.g (fol. 28ra), 31.f (fol. 42vb), 32.b (fol. 43vb), 75.c (fol. 111vb); they also apparently refer to the *Sermones* ("Ser."): Ex. 38.h (fol. 53vb), 43.f (fol. 60ra), and to the *Persuasiones* ("Per."): Ex. 13.m (fol. 18rb), 23.e (fol. 30rb), 23.g (fol. 30vb), 23.h (ibid.). The references in the *Exhortationes* to the *Summa* and *Sermones* (including one I had missed) are noted by Siegfried Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons: Bilingualism and Preaching in Late-Medieval England* (Ann Arbor 1994) 36 n.13; see his discussion at 35-37, and list of contents at 140-148.

<sup>27</sup> Bromyard, *Summa* (as in n.5) A.27.2: *Avaricia quo ad tenacitatem potest fieri in rebus quarum usus est ipsa consumpcio, sicut in pecunia et huiusmodi, vel in rebus que in usu utenti non diminuuntur, sed potius augentur, sicut sciencia et huiusmodi. Et hec videtur detestabilior, videlicet nolle communicare quaternos et scientiam suam. . . Sed dicet, posset verecundiam pati id predicando quod alius de quaterno meo prius in eodem loco dixit. Responderi potest quod caritas non inducit confusionem, et maius meritum accresceret ex caritate quam dampnum ex verecundia.*

## EXPANDING HORIZONS



# CLASSICAL LEARNING AND THE BUILDING OF POWER AT THE FIFTEENTH-CENTURY BURGUNDIAN COURT

A.J. VANDERJAGT

This paper discusses how at the ducal courts of Philip the Good and his son Charles the Bold of fifteenth-century Burgundy classical allusions and classical learning played an important part in conceptualising and formulating ideologies that went hand-in-glove with their building of political power for what is correctly called the Burgundian State<sup>1</sup> and with their practical if not declared independence from the crowns of France and the German Empire. The plural form 'ideologies' is used here, because, although much the same classical material was employed during the reign of Philip (1419-1467) as during the reign of Charles (1467-1477), it was used in different ways.<sup>2</sup>

The term 'classical learning' in the title may appear to suggest that there is an element of humanist or proto-humanist activity at the fifteenth-century Burgundian court, thus linking it to the various humanisms of 'Quattrocento' Italy.<sup>3</sup> However, a claim of

---

<sup>1</sup> The modern standard volumes on the Burgundian dukes are by R. Vaughan: *Philip the Bold. The Formation of the Burgundian State* (London 1962), *John the Fearless. The Growth of Burgundian Power* (London 1966), *Philip the Good. The Apogee of Burgundy* (London 1970), *Charles the Bold. The Last Valois Duke of Burgundy* (London 1973). Exception has been taken to calling the Burgundian sphere of influence a proper *State*; for a summing up of the discussion, see H.P.H. Jansen, A.G. Jongkees, "Een nieuwe Barante", *Bijdragen en mededelingen betreffende de geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 90.1 (1975) 59-70.

<sup>2</sup> See my 'Qui sa vertu anoblist'. *The Concepts of 'noblesse' and 'chose publique' in Burgundian Political Thought* (Groningen 1981) 52ff.; also "Frans-Bourgondische geleerde politici in de vijftiende eeuw", *Theoretische Geschiedenis* 16 (1989) 403-419, 408-411.

<sup>3</sup> A learned attempt to do so is R. Walsh, "The coming of humanism to the Low Countries. Some Italian influences at the court of Charles the Bold", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 25 (1976) 146-197. For an evenhanded discussion of the problems involved, see J. Monfrin, "Le goût des lettres antiques à la cour de Bourgogne au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle", *Bulletin de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France* 1967, 285-287; also his "La connaissance de l'Antiquité et le problème de l'humanisme en langue vulgaire dans la France du XV<sup>e</sup> siècle", *Mediaevalia Lovaniensia* 1, *The Late Middle Ages and the Dawn of Humanism outside of Italy* (1970) 131-170. The presence of humanist

humanism in a meaningful non-general sense of the word cannot be made for the Burgundian court. True, the concepts 'humanism' or *studia humanitatis* might be used for the specific courtly involvement in the educational process. Philip the Good did encourage establishing universities at Dôle (1423) and Louvain (1426) and he sent promising young men from his court and realms to school there and also in Italy. The name of Antoine Haneron (1400-1490) comes to mind here, who introduced the humanistic manuscript hand to the North.<sup>4</sup> He was the professor of grammar and rhetoric at Louvain, and, of course, the teacher of the young Charles the Bold. A few other figures could be mentioned of humanist persuasion, who disseminated especially moralistic-didactic material by Greek and Latin classical authors (or derived from them) in the late 'Trecento' or 'Quattrocento' spirit. By and large, however, the *studia humanitatis* is rare in the Burgundian lands. This is not surprising because such discipline is not particularly useful in a direct way for courtly political matters and the building of political power. Exceptions might be the work in and love for the classics of cardinal Jean Jouffroy (1412-1473)—his enormous library replete with ancient classical and christian authors—who moved in the humanist circles of pope Nicholas V and pope Pius II, utilising his knowledge for his own particular political ends and for the promotion of his career. Another exception is certainly Raphael de Marcatellis (1437-1508), a bastard of Philip the Good and the abbot of St Peter's of Ghent, who, at the very end of the Burgundian state, introduced much classical and fifteenth-century neoplatonism to the North.<sup>5</sup> But these men are clearly black swans in many ways and the term 'humanism' cannot be applied generally to the courtly circles of Burgundy, if only for the fact that humanism's backbone is missing there: the study and the practice of literary Latin.

A concept, however, that can be applied to the influential men of

---

texts at the court does not mean that they were read 'humanistically'; see for an example my "Three solutions to Buonaccorso's *Disputatio de nobilitate*", in: M. Gosman, J. van Os (eds.), *Non nova, sed nove. Mélanges de civilisation médiévale dédiés à Willem Noomen* (Groningen 1984) 247-257.

<sup>4</sup> For research on Haneron, see A. Gerlo, H.D.L. Vervliet, M. de Schepper, Chr.L. Heesakkers (eds.), *Bibliographie de l'humanisme des anciens Pays-Bas* (Brussels 1988) 262-263.

<sup>5</sup> For Jouffroy, see my *Frans-Bourgondische geleerde politici* (as in n.2) 411-415. For Marcatellis, see A. Derolez, *The Library of Raphael de Marcatellis. Abbot of St. Bavon's, Ghent 1437-1508* (Ghent 1979).

Burgundy is the term 'intellectual'. In this context one means by 'intellectuals' those courtiers of whom it is known that they reflected discursively on the special functions and duties of politicians within the 'bien publicque' of Burgundy and put their thoughts about this into practice: traditionalists like Laurens Pignon and Jean Germain at the beginning of Philip the Good's reign and new ideologues like Guillaume Fillastre at its end, and at the close of the Burgundian era, political theorists like Guillaume Hugonet and Philips Wielant and even Charles the Bold himself. Their ideas and ideals can be gleaned from various sources such as first-hand reports or drafts on important matters of policy, from state documents, treaties and speeches, from biographical details found in chronicles or *mémoires*, from prefaces to manuscript books, and, indeed, from the inventories of their personal libraries. These show practical classical learning—mostly in French, of course—in connection with the building of power.<sup>6</sup>

Now, this matter of the intellectuality of the Burgundian court might be thought to be a rather unexciting one. But the reputation in cultural and educational matters of the Burgundian court in modern accounts, histories and catalogues of expositions is unclear and murky. The great Huizinga in *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (1919) put forward a view of Burgundian culture in all its exoticism and bizarreness that led at least one reviewer to exclaim that if Professor Huizinga is right "all Burgundians must have been practically mad".<sup>7</sup> In the late 'sixties', Richard Vaughan, while departing from the 'primitivism' ascribed to Burgundy by Huizinga, insisted that Burgundians did not reflect seriously on their place in the universe or on their political policies, except to ensure their own political aggrandisement.<sup>8</sup> And even more recently, a similar view is put forward by scholars such as A.G. Jongkees, W. Blockmans and R. van Uytven in the relevant chapters of the (*Nieuwe*) *Algemene*

---

<sup>6</sup> Most of this material has not been analysed from this particular angle. Points of departure must be J. Bartier, *Légistes et gens de finances au XVe siècle. Les conseillers des ducs de Bourgogne Philippe le Bon et Charles le Téméraire* (Brussels 1955) and the publications of the Centre Européen d'Études Bourguignonnes (XI<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> s.) under the direction of J.-M. Cauchies.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. F.W.N. Hugenoltz, "The fame of a Masterwork", in: W.R.H. Koops, E.H. Kossmann, G. van der Plaats (eds.), *Papers delivered to the Johan Huizinga Conference Groningen 11-15 December 1972* (The Hague 1973) 99.

<sup>8</sup> For example Vaughan, *John the Fearless* (as in n.1) 289-290.



*Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* (vol.4, Haarlem 1980), in the *Lexikon des Mittelalters* and in numerous other publications, where the non-intellectuality and ceremonious playfulness of the Burgundians is stressed by the use of such terms as 'the theatre state' applied to Bruges, Ghent and to the Court itself.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, Peter Spufford in his introduction to *Spendours of Flanders. Late Medieval Art in Cambridge* (Cambridge 1993), the beautiful catalogue of the exhibition of Flemish manuscripts mounted at the Fitzwilliam Museum in Cambridge in the Summer of 1993, writes without qualification or indeed much foundation about the humanism of the Burgundian court. Careful examination of the record, however, yields a rather different perspective from either Huizinga or Spufford: that of a court quite intellectually aware of ethical, social and political matters, and of courtiers and dukes interested in much more than only self-aggrandisement. Yet, at the same time the picture of a court that is hardly the kind of classroom necessary for the *studia humanitatis*. It should come as no surprise that the political understanding which is necessary successfully to build a state must be underpinned by an intelligent awareness and analysis of how the world works. In the Burgundian case this attitude is formulated in concepts and terms explicitly derived from pagan and christian antiquity.

The ducal library gives a good indication of the tastes of the Burgundian courtiers with regard to the topic of this paper. This library, incidentally, was by far the largest private collection north of the Alps. It contained about 1000 volumes, presenting many more individual works, and was unrivalled even by the Vatican Library. The serious works it possessed could and did give guidelines for political decisions, and they helped Burgundians construct their picture of the politico-social world.<sup>10</sup> Aristotle and pseudo-Aristotle were represented by several copies of French translations of the *Ethics*, *Politics* and *Economics*. There were copies in French of the so-called *Letter of Aristotle to Alexander the Great* and the *Secretum secretorum*; of Cicero's *De officiis* and his letter to his brother Quintus

---

<sup>9</sup> For the expression 'the theatre state', see W. Prevenier and W. Blockmans in their magnificent *De Bourgondische Nederlanden* (Antwerp 1983) 223-227.

<sup>10</sup> The standard study of the library is by G. Doutrepoint, *La littérature française à la Cour des Ducs de Bourgogne. Philippe le Hardi, Jean Sans Peur, Philippe le Bon, Charles le Téméraire* (Paris 1909). Cf. also the discussions in D. Gallet-Guerne, *Vasque de Lucène et la Cyropédie à la cour de Bourgogne (1470)* (Geneva 1974) xi-xx and in my 'Qui sa vertu anoblist' (as in n.2) 12-20.

and Macrobius's *Commentarius ex Cicerone in somnium Scipionem*; of Xenophon's *Hieron* and *Cyropaideia*. Vegetius's *Military procedure* was present as was Augustine's *City of God* and the florilegium culled from it by Francis of Meyronnes. More or less contemporary works on the theory of nobility, on the tasks of chivalry and the juridical rules governing the recognition of a state by Diego de Valera, Buonaccorso da Montemagno, Giovanni Aurispa and Honoré Bouvet complemented the older views of Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, Raymundus Lullus and Laurent du Bois. Much of the political work of Christine de Pizan was available: her debate on the 'election of princes suited to govern the world', her *Faits d'armes et de chevalerie*, the *Livre de Paix*, a number of copies of her *Livre du corps de policie*. Besides, the library had a large number of histories—often with prefaces describing them as mirrors for princes; some, like Julius Caesar's frenched *Commentaires*, deriving from classical antiquity, others from contemporary sources, like the three deluxe manuscripts of French translations of Leonardo Bruni Aretino's *First Punic War*. Philip of Leiden's *De cura reipublicae et sorte principantis* is present, and also copies of Jean Pelleret's work on the duties of princes.

Courtiers closely involved with the dukes' making of policy had their own libraries. Jean Jouffroy, for example, owned perhaps the second largest collection in France and Burgundy—stockpiled in three places: Rome, Carcassonne and Brussels. In it there is a great deal of philology, theology, exegesis, and rhetoric, as might be expected of a bishop of his tastes. But he also possessed a number of political works such as those of Cicero and John of Salisbury.<sup>11</sup> And when the last Burgundian chancellor Guillaume Hugonet was beheaded by angry townsmen at Ghent in 1477, he left his wife a library including works by Cicero, Seneca, Vegetius, Caesar, Lactantius and Bartolus of Saxoferrato, all authors whom he cites at length and with apparent pleasure in the speeches he made on the behalf of duke Charles.<sup>12</sup> This illustrates that these libraries were, to a large degree, also working libraries and not merely collections

<sup>11</sup> For a bibliography see my *Frans-Bourgondische geleerde politici* (as in n.5).

<sup>12</sup> See my "Burgundian Political Ideas between Laurentius Pignon and Guillaume Hugonet", *Fifteenth-Century Studies* 9 (1984) 197-214; for his library, see L.P. Gachard, "Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de Guillaume Hugonet, chancelier de Bourgogne", *Compte-rendu des séances de la Commission Royale d'Histoire ou Recueil de ses bulletins* 2 (1838) 120-127.

of precious exotic works. In a sense, too, this book-collecting can be described in the terms of a 'centre of learning'. The scribes and translators who worked to stock these libraries had offices and workshops in which a next generation was trained. For obvious purposes Philip the Good also made sure that his courtiers and administrators had been university taught and that they had access to his book collections. As can be demonstrated from the vicissitudes of the different interpretations of the story of the Golden Fleece between 1430 and 1470, the same material was commented upon by different generations of scholarly politicians of the court. This brings one to the way in which classical allusions were used at the Burgundian court to create an ideology of power. The famous story of how, with the help of the princess Medea, Jason and his Argonauts sought to retrieve the Golden Fleece from Colchis at the far eastern end of the Black Sea, where it was said to be guarded by a dragon, seems first to have entered the Valois family history in 1393, when Philip's grandfather Philip the Bold acquired two tapestries picturing Jason's activities. From inventories we know that these were passed on to Philip the Good through his father John the Fearless. Perhaps these pictures stirred Philip's imagination or that of his advisors, for in January 1430, on the occasion of his (third) marriage to Isabella of Portugal he instituted the chivalric *Order of the Golden Fleece*.<sup>13</sup> It seems that not 'books' but pictures—and perhaps oral stories—first stimulated Philip's choice of theme for his new order of chivalry. Yet, this interest was soon transferred to written texts. In the library inventory of 1420 there is still only one obscure manuscript with this exotic tale but in the inventory of 1467 there are no fewer than sixteen. From the evidence it is clear, too, that the year between 1430 and 1431 showed massive activity in relating the adventures of Jason and of applying them to the duties of the members of the new order. Part of this activity was apparently paid for by the 100,000 crowns that the Estates of Flanders awarded Philip to cover the initial expenses of the Order.

A comparison of the story of the Golden Fleece and the Statutes and Bylaws of the Order shows how Philip and his ideologues utilised elements from the *Argonautica* to weld a powerful chivalric group of Burgundian knights devoted to a common goal on the basis

---

<sup>13</sup> On the Order see D'A.J.D. Boulton, *The Knights of the Crown. The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe 1325-1520* (New York 1987) Ch. 13.

of the four ancient cardinal virtues of *fortitudo*, *iustitia*, *prudentia* and *benevolentia* (*magnanimitas*). This primarily classical and pagan mythological foundation raised the horror of bishop Jean Germain of Tournai, who soon prevailed in his attempts to christianise Philip's activities. He rewrote the story of the Golden Fleece—symbolising Jason's courage—to include five Biblical fleeces: those of Jacob (justice), Gideon (prudence), Mesa, king of Moab (loyalty), Job (faith) and finally, that of David (grace).<sup>14</sup> This christianization of the initially pagan, classical story was accepted by Philip, as might be considered only fitting when one thinks of the role the Order played in Burgundian crusading ideas of the mid-1440s.<sup>15</sup> The Order of the Golden Fleece became one of Philip's most useful instruments in binding to himself the highest nobility of his diverse estates and counties.<sup>16</sup> The members of the Order imbibed these classical and biblical allusions from a dossier of documents about the ideas of the Order prepared for each. The ideology of the Order itself shows an interesting development from the activities of Jean Germain in the 1430s, who made it into a christian one based on the hierarchical principles of the ecclesiology of Giles of Rome and Thomas Aquinas, to the reworking of it in the 1460s by Guillaume Fillastre, another bishop of Tournai, on the basis of a new reading of Aristotle and the function of the cardinal virtues in the context of the 'bien publicque'.<sup>17</sup> This shows that the literary material and the classical allusions of this particular 'centre of learning' were not 'dead', but that they were developed and reworked to suit practical considerations. Similar remarks might be made about the use that was made of other stories from Troy or from the Roman Empire.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Doutrepont, *La littérature française* (as in n.10) 147-171.

<sup>15</sup> Vaughan, *Philip the Good* (as in n.1) 162, denies the Order a role in the development of Burgundian crusading ideas, but see my "'Qui desirent veoir du monde': Bourgondiërs en de Oriënt", in H. Bakker, M. Gosman (eds.), *De Oriënt. Droom of dreiging. Het Oosten in Westers Perspectief* (Kampen 1988) 18-37.

<sup>16</sup> Vaughan, *Philip the Good* (as in n.1) 161.

<sup>17</sup> See Fillastre's manuscript history of the Order: *Histoire de la Toison d'Or*; for a description of the different manuscripts, see P. Cockshaw et al. (eds.), *Karel de Stoute 1433-1477. Tentoonstelling georganiseerd naar aanleiding van de vijfhonderdste verjaring van zijn dood* (Brussels 1977) 89-92; also my *Burgundian Political Ideas* (as in n.12) 208-211.

<sup>18</sup> For Troy see, of course, Doutrepont, *La littérature française* (as in n.10) but also M. Cheyns-Condé, "L'Épopée troyenne dans la 'librairie' ducal bourguignonne au XV<sup>e</sup> siècle", *Rencontres de Middelbourg/Bergen-op-Zoom 27 au 30 septembre 1990, Publication du Centre Européen d'Études Bourguignonnes (XIV<sup>e</sup>-XVI<sup>e</sup> s.)* 31 (1991)

Besides a rich use of classical allusions there is also classical learning of sorts at the Burgundian court. Two illustrations might be given here of classical learning and its connection to the building of political power. The first example is that of Jean Miélot and his use of four Ciceronian works of a socio-political nature: Cicero's *De officiis* (On duty) and his *Letter to Quintus on the governance of a province*, Giovanni Aurispa's rendition of Lucian's *Twelfth Dialogue of the Dead* and Buonaccorso da Montemagno's *De nobilitate*. The second example is the work of Vasco da Lucena (Vasque de Lucène) with regard to Xenophon's *Cyropaideia* (Education of Cyrus the Great).

Jean Miélot appears in Burgundian accounts from 1449, when he was appointed honorary secretary to Philip the Good.<sup>19</sup> In this capacity he produced a large number of manuscript books for the duke. The socio-political ones must have been highly influential because no other works produced by Miélot led to the making of a greater number of copies. The Cicero, Buonaccorso and Aurispa texts, some of which are lavishly illustrated, were especially popular in Burgundian courtly circles. This is curious because Buonaccorso and Aurispa wrote their treatises in the 'civic humanist' spirit of 'Quattrocento' Northern Italy and Cicero's two works were favourite items in the same circles. All three are generally seen as paradigmatic for North-Italian republican tastes, but apparently they were also highly appreciated by the politically powerful and culturally discerning courtiers of Burgundy. Why? How did they make the transition from the republican commune of Florence to the ducal high court of Burgundy?

Several points might be made in this context. First, that the central theme in Cicero, Buonaccorso and Aurispa is a high regard for the *bonum commune* or as it is called in Burgundy the 'bien publique' and for its governance and administration through suitably trained administrators. Each of these texts calls to the reader's special attention the moral qualities required of the governor of a state. Besides, they completely divorce the four cardinal virtues necessary for politics and social life from the three christian virtues necessary for

---

37-65; for Caesar the unpublished history thesis (Oberlin College) by M. Nelson, *Julius Caesar in Medieval France. The Textual Sources and Iconography of the Faits des Romains* (supervised by M.L. Colish, W.E. Hood) 1990.

<sup>19</sup> See my '*Qui sa vertu anoblist*' (as in n.2) 151ff., and passim on this and the following. On Miélot's 'Ciceronian' activities, see R. Bossuat, 'Jean Miélot. Traducteur de Cicéron', *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 99 (1938) 83-124.

personal salvation. Second, even though Burgundians and North-Italian 'republicans' had widely different views with regard to the best structure for a political community, the polity and administration which helped them maintain their independence from ecclesiastical, imperial and regal authority made very similar practical demands on them. These demands they formulated in a Ciceronian spirit. Thirdly, Miélot was not a mechanical translator but a scholar sensitive to the needs of his ducal master. He made a number of subtle but significant changes in the translation of his texts, in this way adapting the originals to Burgundian political circumstances. Thus he added didactic introductions explaining what according to him each text was about. He also changed key words in the text referring to republican values to words more congenial to ducal government. Thus *patria* becomes 'le pays' or 'bien publique' and *militaris* becomes 'chevalerie'. Furthermore, the controversies by Buonaccorso and Aurispa are addressed to the duke as the final adjudicator and not to the reader as in the originals.<sup>20</sup> It must be noted here as well that the treatises by Buonaccorso and Aurispa are suitable for readers not used to abstruse philosophical literature. Their ideas are couched in stories of romance and chivalric prowess, which are equally suited to the tastes of high courtly circles of Burgundy and of the general voracious readers of international Flemish urban life in the fifteenth century.

Taking into account these works and the material from the ducal administrative headquarters—prologues to laws: for example, those governing the minting of money, treaties and requests to the estates for financial subvention—one notices the same key terms and concepts that form the centrepiece of Burgundian ideology in the second half of Philip's reign: a secularisation of the virtue of justice, an emphasis on concord and harmony, and the idea of the duke as *primus*—albeit at least ideologically *primus inter pares*. It was on the basis of this ideology, derived from classical allusions and classical learning that Philip built his power.

His son, Charles the Bold, and the sons of his contemporary noblemen and high officials were brought up with these and similar

---

<sup>20</sup> See my *Three solutions* (as in n.3) 251ff. On Buonaccorso's text the most recent work is A. Rabil Jr. (ed.), *Knowledge, Goodness, and Power: The Debate over Nobility among Quattrocento Italian Humanists* (Binghamton 1991) 24-52; a translation is included.

ideas, which they imbibed from their masters at Dôle and Louvain, and from their Italianate friends in Bruges and Ghent. It is precisely this ground that yet again proved fertile for the sowing of new classical learning. In turn this affected profoundly the ambitious plans and ideals of Charles the Bold and his chancellor Guillaume Hugonet, plans that in 1477 were brought to such an inglorious end in the marshes of Nancy and on the scaffold of the Friday market at Ghent. Clear statements as to the knowledge of the ideological up-bringing that Charles and Guillaume had, can be found in Hugonet's address on the first of November 1471 at St-Omer, on the occasion of the signing of the treaty between Charles and king Ferrante of Naples, and also in the preamble to the Thionville ordinances of 1473 establishing a central, independent judicial power, a *Parlement*, at Malines, so emphasising the independence of the Burgundian state from the royal Parliament at Paris. These pieces are full of quotations from Lactantius, Augustine and in particular from Cicero's *De officiis*. But already there is a disposition to use these authors in a new context. This context is provided by the work of Guillaume Fillastre and Vasco da Lucena.<sup>21</sup>

Like his father, Charles placed a strong emphasis on justice as the foundation of civil society and of concord between the estates and reigning princes. Yet here justice in the full sense of the word is the prerogative, not of the duke on the grounds of his bonds with regal, imperial and papal power, but of the duke by virtue of his own, personal magnificence.<sup>22</sup> It is here that Fillastre's reworking in 1468 of Germain's ideals of the Golden Fleece plays an important part. Germain's ideology traditionally associates the prime virtue of justice in its full sense with papal authority, from there dispensed down to other powers. On the other hand, Fillastre relegated justice to second place and postulated 'magnanimitas' and 'magnificentia' as prime among the four cardinal virtues. This fitted in wonderfully both with Charles's authoritarian streak of taking the law into his own hands—thereby often ignoring and infringing on local jurisdictions—and with his understanding of his own duties as

<sup>21</sup> Gallet-Guerne, *Vasque de Lucène* (as in n.10).

<sup>22</sup> G. Kipling, *The Triumph of Honour. Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance* (Leiden 1978) and idem, "John Skelton and Burgundian Letters", in: J. van Dorsten (ed.), *Ten Studies in Anglo-Dutch Relations* (Leiden 1974) 1-29; for Charles's practice see R. Walsh, "Charles the Bold and the 'monstrous ransom' story", *Bulletin of the Society for Renaissance Studies* 5 (1987) 1-13.

he discovered them in Jean Miélot's translation of Cicero's advice to his brother Quintus and Vasco da Lucena's influential translation of Poggio's Latin rendition of Xenophon's *Education of Cyrus*. In Cicero's letter much is made of the story that Scipio—one of Charles's heroes—assiduously studied Xenophon's work, not often putting it out of his hands, and Vasco's introduction mentions Alexander the Great, another model for Charles with the same emphasis. But the idea is clinched into place by the knowledge that God, in the Old Testament book of Isaiah, directly and without ecclesiastical intermediaries appointed Cyrus the Great as his own 'shepherd' to dispense justice and to do his will in all ways. This is the pattern that Charles was intent on following. Without doubt it fitted well with his ambition of being crowned king of his own Burgundian State—albeit such an idea was as remote as the contemporary idea of a kingdom of Frisia.<sup>23</sup> This gives some indication of the power of classical allusions and scholarship in the development of Burgundian ideologies of power, and it shows the Burgundian court as a centre of practical political learning.

---

<sup>23</sup> A.G. Jongkees, *Het koninkrijk Friesland in de vijftiende eeuw* (Groningen-Batavia 1946); Vaughan, *Charles the Bold* (as in n.1) 152, 184-186.





*AUCUNS PETIS ENSEIGNEMENS*: 'HOME-MADE'  
COURTESY BOOKS IN MEDIEVAL FRANCE

ANNE MARIE DE GENDT

Recent studies focusing on family life and childhood in the Middle Ages have brought to the fore the role of the family in children's education.<sup>1</sup> Until the age of seven the infant, boy or girl, was entirely cared for by his parents. When he reached the age of reason, the child started his intellectual training, which was usually entrusted to a school. His education in the wider sense of the word, however, remained the privilege of the family. Of course not every child received the same education; much depended on social status and sex. Young girls of the upper classes usually learned to read—and sometimes even to write—either at school or at home, with the help of a private tutor. Furthermore, they were educated by their mothers, who taught them the traditional social skills of a woman of their upbringing as well as how to run a household, and who fostered in them the 'qualities and paths of conduct considered desirable' for a young woman of good repute.<sup>2</sup> Thus their education was essentially practical and moral: it was a preparation for life. This concept of education is reflected in the didactic writings addressed to young girls and women, which we find all over Europe. These works never aim to improve the scholarly knowledge of their audience; on the contrary, they are normative texts, which propose and impose models and values, and which sometimes contain practical advice for everyday life. The nobility and the upper middle classes had such courtesy books at their disposal.<sup>3</sup> Some parents, however, still felt

---

<sup>1</sup> D. Alexandre-Bidon, M. Closson, *L'Enfant à l'ombre des cathédrales* (Paris 1985); D.D. Berkvam, "Nature and *norreture*: a notion of medieval childhood and education", *Medievalia* 9 (1986) 165-180; A. Burton, "Looking forward from Ariès? Pictorial and material evidence for the history of childhood and family life", *Continuity and Change* 4.2 (1989) 203-229; A. Giallongo, *Il bambino medievale. Educazione e infanzia nel Medioevo* (Bari 1990); S. Shahar, *Childhood in the Middle Ages* (London/New York 1990).

<sup>2</sup> Shahar, *Childhood* (as in n.1) 174. For further details concerning the education of young girls of noble extraction, see *ibidem*, 220-223.

<sup>3</sup> Inventories show that the libraries of the high nobility were well provided with such works. We also know that the gentry had access to them. For example, the

the need to present their daughters with an educative treatise from their own hand. In the following pages we discuss the specific nature of these 'home-made' texts and try to explain why their authors, who generally were not 'professional' writers,<sup>4</sup> did not merely use one of the existing didactic works.

In French, only three didactic manuals written by parents for—as they suggest—family use have been preserved.<sup>5</sup> First there is a short treatise, known as the *Enseignements de Saint Louis a sa fille Isabelle*, which Louis IX composed for his eldest and favourite daughter Isabelle (1242-1271), after her marriage in 1255 to the King of Navarre;<sup>6</sup> it is written in the form of a letter.<sup>7</sup> We owe our second text, the *Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry pour l'enseignement de ses filles* (1371-1372) to an Angevin knight, Geoffroy de la Tour Landry, who wrote it for his three daughters, Jeanne, Anne and Marie. These two works seem to have influenced our third text, the *Enseignements* by Anne of France. This princess, a daughter of Louis XI and regent of France until her brother, Charles VIII, came of age, composed the *Enseignements* in—presumably—1504 for her daughter Suzanne, who was nearly fifteen and was promised to the Duke Charles of Bourbon.

These three works are situated on the crossroads of different traditions. First of all, they are part of a long line of nonreligious didactic treatises in the vernacular, written for women. Furthermore, two of them were composed by and for persons of royal blood. Like one of

---

Chevalier de la Tour Landry (see below) exploited the *Miroir des bonnes et des preudes femmes*, an as yet unpublished didactic treatise from the thirteenth century; see J. Grigsby, "A new source of the *Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry*", *Romania* 84 (1963) 171-208. Recent lectures by Kathleen Ashley show that between the fourteenth and the sixteenth century, a manuscript of this same *Miroir* circulated among several families of the urban elite in Chalons-sur-Saône.

<sup>4</sup> The only parent to whom we might attribute some literary ambition is the Knight of la Tour Landry (see below), for he claims in his prologue that he has written various lyric poems in his youth.

<sup>5</sup> I leave aside the *Ménagier de Paris*, a manual written around 1392 by a member of the upper middle class in Paris for his fifteen-year-old wife. In this article I limit myself to the books that were written by parents. As we shall see, in the French territory such parents belong exclusively to the aristocracy.

<sup>6</sup> The exact date of the *Enseignements* is unknown, but the King addresses his daughter as Queen of Navarre.

<sup>7</sup> After Isabelle's marriage, the King and his daughter usually resided far away from each other. See D. O'Connell, *The Instructions of Saint Louis. A Critical Text* (Chapel Hill 1979) 61. For further information concerning the *Enseignements*, see *ibidem*.

their earlier Latin counterparts, the *De Eruditione Filiorum Nobilium* by Vincent of Beauvais, which contains some chapters on the education of princesses, they echo the numerous *Gouvernements*, *Instructions*, *Informacions des princes* that we find in royal, princely and ducal libraries and which, one assumes, have been used for the instruction of the owners' children.<sup>8</sup> The case of the *Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry* is slightly different. The author belongs to the gentry of Anjou. Nevertheless, in his prologue the Knight refers to a royal auctoritas, namely the book that Queen Prines of Hungary is said to have composed for her daughters; in this way he indirectly places his work in the tradition of royal *Enseignements*.<sup>9</sup> Finally, our texts are also related, albeit in a less obvious way, to the *oikonomia*. These 'domestic writings' discuss every possible aspect of the 'household' (in the broad, medieval sense of the word). In the Middle Ages, as in antiquity, economics, in the sense of the doctrine of a household, comprises "un complexe d'enseignements appartenant à l'Ethique, la Sociologie, la Pédagogie, la Médecine et aux différentes techniques de la science de la maison et de l'agriculture".<sup>10</sup> Hence economics also concerns the relationship between husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants and even the spiritual well-being of all those who lived together under the same roof. Contrary to the *Ménagier de Paris*, the typical example of a piece of medieval French domestic writing,<sup>11</sup> the texts presently under discussion hardly contain practical advice on housekeeping, cooking, etcetera. All three authors, however, reveal their strong concern with the spiritual well-being of their daughters. They also discuss, albeit briefly, the relations between children and parents, husband and wife. The *Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry* and, particularly,

<sup>8</sup> In some cases we have evidence of this. We know, for example, that the father of Anne de France, King Louis XI, commissioned for his son, Charles VIII, the *Rosier des Guerres*, a collection of teachings which were considered useful to a prince who would some day have to reign. See A.M. Chazaud, *Les Enseignements d'Anne de France*. Texte original publié d'après le manuscrit unique de Saint Petersburg (Moulines 1878) XV, XVI, XVIII (n.1).

<sup>9</sup> See A.M. De Gendt "Le Livre de la royne Prines: le modèle qui n'existe pas?" (forthcoming in *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*).

<sup>10</sup> O. Brunner, "Die alteuropäische 'Oekonomik'", *Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie* 13 (1950); here quoted from M. Zimmermann, "'Curieuse bible domestique' et texte-seuil de la prose narrative en France: *Le Ménagier de Paris* (vers 1393)", in: D. Kremer (ed.), *Actes du XVIIIème Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes* (Tübingen 1988) 385-394.

<sup>11</sup> This has been clearly demonstrated by M. Zimmermann in her article *Curieuse bible domestique* (as in n.10).

the *Enseignements* of Anne de France contain advice on children's education. The latter text, as well as the teachings of Saint Louis, also makes suggestions as how to deal with attendants and servants.<sup>12</sup>

Now that the genre of French educative treatises written by parents for their daughters has been briefly characterised, it is appropriate to establish the particular nature of these texts as instruments for family learning.<sup>13</sup> In this context the audience, the *causa scribendi*, the author's objective, the making of the different texts and the nature of their teachings will be examined in succession. The *Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry* will be the starting point for each of these topics, because this text is richest in relevant information (though it is not chronologically the earliest one).

Often, and this goes for all three texts, the necessary information can be found in the prologue. The book of the Knight of la Tour Landry has a rather long one. After telling the reader how the work was conceived, the author defines his project: he identifies the people for whom he is writing, the purpose of his book as well as the sources from which he has taken his material. The treatise of Louis IX hardly has a prologue; instead, this function is taken over by the first paragraph. For her part, Anne of France has deliberately kept her prologue as short as possible: *sans vous faire nulz longs prologues, ne aussi de peu de chose grans parlemens* (AF,2); she informs us mainly about the presumed reader and the *causa scribendi*.

As far as the audience is concerned, a distinction has to be made between the target audience—was the author really just thinking of his family?—and the people who might also have used the book.<sup>14</sup> The Knight of la Tour Landry explicitly names and qualifies his audience: *mes filles . . . jeunes et petites et de sens desgarnies* (CTL,2). Throughout the prologue, his daughters appear as the immediate public for whom he is writing: *je leur feroye un livret* (CTL,3), *pour mes filles aprendre* (CTL,4), etc. However, the author never addresses them directly. If one considers that traditionally one of the functions of a prologue is to establish a relationship—be it real or fictional—

<sup>12</sup> I return to these points below.

<sup>13</sup> Reference is made to the following editions: CTL = A. de Montaiglon, *Le Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry. Pour l'enseignement de ses filles* (Paris 1854); ISL = O'Connell, *Instructions* (as in n.6); AF = Chazaud, *Enseignements d'Anne de France* (as in n.8) (Moulins 1878).

<sup>14</sup> Admittedly, complete knowledge of the second group is impossible.

with the audience, one might expect the Knight to address them in the second person, as he does everywhere else in the book. Yet the prologue takes on the aspect of a long monologue, in which the author definitely does not address the young girls, who are referred to in the third person. It is not without interest to note that the use of the word *vous* in the short phrase *et pour cestes raysons que dict vous ay* (CTL,4) suggests one or more imaginary interlocutors. Could this mean that the author is trying to reach a much larger audience than he himself is ready to admit? It is true that the *Livre* itself has the form of a long direct discourse, abundant in vocatives such as *mes chières filles*, and in chapter XXI, when talking about the feminine *atours*, the Knight states:

*je ne pense sur nuelles en parler par cest livre, fors que à mes propres filles et à mes femmes servantes, à qui je puis dire et monstrer ce que je vueil* (CTL,49).

But very often the author says at the end of the tales which he inserts that *y a bon exemple à toutes bonnes femmes et bonnes dames* (CTL,60), which seems to imply a much wider audience. Be that as it may, the literary fortunes of the *Livre* attest that it was not only used by members of the author's household: twenty-one French manuscripts, three editions in French from the sixteenth century as well as two English and one German translation from the fifteenth century are sufficient proof of the popularity of the work.

Saint Louis intended his instructions for family use only. His letter opens with a salutation, typical of his era: *A sa chiere et amee fille Ysabel, roine de Navarre, salus et amistié de pere* (ISL,78). From the first paragraph onwards the King addresses his daughter in the second person, and the majority of paragraphs begin with the vocative: *Chiere fille*. The short treatise ends with the following recommendation: *Je vous commant que nus ne voie chest escrit sanz mon congiet, excepté vostre frere* (ISL,81). Of all the late thirteenth and early fourteenth-century biographers who have left us a life of Saint Louis, only Yves de Saint-Denis and Guillaume de Saint-Pathus seem to have heard of the *Enseignements*: the first only mentions them, whereas the latter furnishes the text. This is all the more surprising when we realise that the educative treatise which Saint Louis wrote for his eldest son and successor Philippe—a text that presents strong analogies with the one addressed to Isabelle—appears in every biography of the King. According to David O'Connell, this omission seems to indicate that the majority of the early biographers did not have access to the *Enseignements* to Isabelle and that they were even unaware of

their existence; "in other words, Louis' order to keep the Instructions within the narrow circumference of the family seems to have been quite faithfully obeyed."<sup>15</sup> Though the text was never widely circulated in the first place, the *Enseignements* have been preserved in eight manuscripts dating from the later Middle Ages. They can be divided in two manuscript families; one of them offers a Latinised version, evidently copied from the Saint-Pathus text. There are even two forgeries, one written in the fourteenth, the other in the fifteenth century;<sup>16</sup> these are indirect evidence of the literary fortunes of the original and, even more so, of the popularity of its author long after his death.

In her prologue, Anne of France also employs the second person to address her daughter Suzanne, using the vocative *ma fille*, which she repeats frequently throughout the book. We have only one manuscript of her work, which bears the motto of the Princess's late husband: *Esperance*. On the first endpaper are traced two lines in Suzanne's own hand,<sup>17</sup> testifying that the book belongs to her. On the second endpaper we find the initials of both Suzanne and her husband. Even if this book did really function as a family book, it is also true that Suzanne de Bourbon herself seems to have wanted the book to be known to a wider audience, for she ordered an edition which was published in Lyon, at the publishing house Le Prince (AF,XI).

Now to the *causa scribendi*. In his prologue the Knight of la Tour Landry dwells upon the reasons that moved him to write the *Livre*. His motives are all related directly to his role as a father of young daughters who should be instructed. First there is a feeling of fatherly concern, which is motivated not only by his daughters' youth, and hence (supposed) lack of wisdom, but also by the dangers of a hypocritical world.<sup>18</sup> Then the Knight refers to his duty (CTL,2), a notion which he takes up again at the end of the prologue, placing it in a wider perspective: his task follows from a universal law according to which

*tout père et mère selon Dieu et nature doit enseigner ses enfans et les destourner de male voye et leur monstrier le vray et droit chemin* (CTL,4).

<sup>15</sup> O'Connell, *Instructions* (as in n.7) 49.

<sup>16</sup> See O'Connell, *Instructions* (as in n.7) Appendix.

<sup>17</sup> *Ce livre est à moy, Susanne de Bourbon, et l'ey eu de la maison de Bourbon* (AF,III).

<sup>18</sup> See A.M. De Gendt, "Sens et fonction du prologue dans *Le Livre du Chevalier de la Tour Landry*"; forthcoming in *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*.

These words reflect the medieval idea that the responsibility for the education of children rests with both father and mother. It was, incidentally, this same sense of duty that, on his own testimony, inspired the author to compose for his sons a similar book, which has never been found. Finally, at the end of the prologue the Knight introduces a new element, fatherly love. Here too a sense of duty intervenes: *et aussi pour la grant amour que je ay à mes enfans, lesquelz je ayme comme père les doit aimer* (CTL,4).

Saint Louis was motivated by different reasons. He explains them in the first paragraph:

*Chière fille, pource que je croi que vous retendrez plus volentiers de moi, pour lamour que vous avez a moi, que vous ne feriez de pluisours autres; je pense que je vous ferai aucuns enseignemenz, escriz de ma propre main* (ISL,82).

It is the privileged relationship between father and daughter, based on filial love, that incites him to write in his own hand some instructions which, theoretically, anyone else could have formulated. At the beginning of the teachings for Philippe we read a similar passage: *je t'oy dire aucunes foiz que tu retendroies plus de moy que d'autrui*.<sup>19</sup> In alluding to other possible instructors, was the King thinking of Vincent of Beauvais, author of the treatise *De Eruditione Filiorum Nobilium*, composed for the royal infants at a time when they were still too young to read for themselves, or was he making a reference to the *magistri* who, according to the words of the great Dominican, were to convey his teachings to the children? Neither is impossible.

The motives of Anne of France are similar to those of the Knight of la Tour: the love that every mother feels for a daughter and the fear for the many pitfalls of *la meschante vie presente* (AF,1). Add to this feminine fragility, the ignorance (*sic*) of Suzanne, inherent to her youth, and the constant threat of early death on the part of the author, whose health was uncertain. There is, however, no explicit reference to a feeling of duty.

In all three treatises the relationship between parent and child thus lies at the heart of the motives which inspired their composition. For each author it is the mere fact of being the parent of a young daughter in need of an education that explains and justifies his or her literary initiative.

---

<sup>19</sup> D. O'Connell, *The Teachings of Saint Louis. A Critical Text* (Chapel Hill 1972) 55.



What were the objectives pursued by our authors? The Knight of la Tour Landry makes no secret of his. He wants his daughters to *à bien et à honneur tourn[er] sur toutes riens* (CTL,2). His book should help them acquire a good reputation in this world and eternal life in the next one. There is, however, one more thing the Knight wants his daughters to learn from his book, and that is to *romancier*. Having first introduced his literary plans, he voices his intention to make

... un livret pour apprendre à romancier, affin que [mes filles] peussent apprendre et estudier, et veoir et le bien et le mal qui passé est, pour elles garder de cellui temps qui à venir est (CTL,3).

The word *romancier* appears in two other passages of the prologue, in a similar context. We have good reason to believe that it means 'to read a text written in a romance language'. Therefore, *apprendre a romancier* would mean learning to read a book in the vernacular. Thus the use of this word allows us to discover a second possible function of this educational treatise. When Geoffroi's daughters began to learn to read, presumably at home, they could use his *Livre* as a reader.<sup>20</sup>

Although it is evident that Saint Louis' main concern is his daughter's spiritual well-being and—but this is less emphasised—her happiness in this world, he does not announce a specific objective. Anne of France hopes that her daughter will remember her words when she needs them, and that they may prove useful to her.<sup>21</sup>

What do we know about the making of our texts and about the precise role of the author in this process? Very likely, the Knight of la Tour Landry played an active part in the process of collecting and selecting the material, and was himself responsible for the final redaction of his *Livre*.<sup>22</sup> King Louis declares that his text is hand-

---

<sup>20</sup> This seems to imply that the daughters of the Knight were younger than the average addressee of courtesy books, who, usually, has reached the threshold of adolescence. On this point, and also concerning the interpretation of the word *romancier*, see De Gendt, *Sens et fonction* (as in n.18).

<sup>21</sup> Further research is needed to establish exactly when the *Enseignements* were written; only then will one know how old Suzanne was at the time. Chazaud does not give any arguments for the tentative dating he proposes (AF,I-II). According to the editor, the girl might have been fourteen years of age, but the words used by the princess—*vostre ignorance et petite jeunesse* (AF,1)—do not exclude the possibility that Suzanne was even younger. That is, of course, unless Anne of France was simply borrowing the words of la Tour Landry, whose book she possessed (AF,XXXI).

<sup>22</sup> See De Gendt, *Sens et fonction* (as in n.18).

written. Although the original has not been discovered yet,<sup>23</sup> the intimate character of his *Enseignements* as well as their brevity seem to support his claim. Anne of France does not give any information about the making of her book.

Do the works we are discussing here meet the needs of the domestic audience for which they were intended? Within the limited scope of this article, only a few general remarks can be made.<sup>24</sup> In the treatises of Saint Louis and Anne of France one finds numerous teachings that are universally valid. Yet in other parts the author focuses on the specific needs of his reader. These passages contain guidelines for dealing with the attendants and servants that surround a princess. Anne of France also includes paragraphs on the atmosphere and proper behaviour at court, as well as some advice in case she herself should die before Suzanne gets married—something that would force her to find a position as lady-in-waiting. Even when she gives more general advice it is clear that the Princess is highly conscious of the social status she and her daughter enjoy, and of the many responsibilities that come with it: the nobility has to set an example. The book of the Knight of la Tour Landry contains several anecdotes featuring the author's relatives and acquaintances, but most of his admonitions have a more general character and would be useful for any noble girl or woman.<sup>25</sup> And thus Jeanne, Anne and Marie de la Tour Landry remain shadowy figures, whose names are not even mentioned.

Primarily conceived for and read by members of the author's own family, the French didactic manuals composed by parents owe their existence first and foremost to the privileged relationship between parents and children,<sup>26</sup> as Saint Louis so poignantly says. Moreover, they present us with a personal reformulation of conventional

---

<sup>23</sup> See O'Connell, *Instructions* (as in n.7) 27-28 and chapters III and IV. Medieval sources claim that the King composed the teachings himself, but of course this information might be taken from the text itself.

<sup>24</sup> For a detailed study of this subject as far as the treatise of la Tour Landry is concerned, see the present author's study of the *Livre* (forthcoming).

<sup>25</sup> This, indeed, is emphasized in the prologue to the English translation by Caxton (M. Offord, *The Book of the Knight of the Tower translated by William Caxton* [London 1971] 3) as well as in the prologue of the German translator, the Knight Marquart von Stein: R. Harvey (ed.), *Marquart vom Stein, Der Ritter vom Turn* (Berlin 1988) 87.

<sup>26</sup> As far as the Knight of la Tour Landry is concerned, further research should bring to light to what extent his work may have served to satisfy more literary ambitions (see e.g. p.283 and n.4)—in which case the domestic setting could very well have been used as a literary artifice.

wisdom, adapted, to a certain extent, to the specific needs of the intended family audience, particularly when this audience is of royal blood. Thus they also give us a rather good impression of the personality of their authors and of the values they themselves upheld and wished to pass on to their children.<sup>27</sup> One may note that even though the responsibility for the child's education rests with both father and mother, the actual writing is usually done by the man.<sup>28</sup> In rare cases, courtesy books written for family use could serve yet another purpose in the child's education at home; the *Livre* of the Knight of la Tour Landry, for example, seems also to have been used as a reader. In these several ways the educational writings discussed here really enjoy a special position among the numerous *Miroirs*, *Chastoiments* and *Enseignements* for women. Where educational writing is concerned, there is nothing to beat what is 'home-made'.

---

<sup>27</sup> The instructions of Saint Louis, for example, have an essentially religious character.

<sup>28</sup> There is a slight change towards the end of the Middle Ages, in France as well as in other countries. One may think for example of the *Enseignemens que une dame laisse a ses deux filz, en forme de Testament* (end of the fifteenth century) and the English treatise *How the Good wiif taughte hir doughtir* (approximately 1391)—unless, of course, the female authorship here is a pure literary fiction . . .

## THE RENAISSANCE HOUSEHOLD AS CENTRE OF LEARNING

A.A. MACDONALD

Centres of learning may be formal or informal, either institutions dedicated to the systematic inculcation of learning, or locations in which learning more or less haphazardly takes place. The following discussion focuses on one sort of informal centre, the late-medieval and Renaissance household, the importance of which as a location of learning has perhaps not received due attention. In a very general sense, of course, the role of the household as centre of learning is a universal one, since there is no-one, probably, who does not begin his education within the family circle. Moreover, it has always been common for professional skills to be handed down from one generation to another within the family. To what extent, then, is it possible to problematise a particular aspect of this huge subject? One might suggest that there is a particular relationship between the new humanistic learning associated with the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance and the household circumstances in which this new learning was prosecuted. Examples will be drawn principally from the situation in the British Isles in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, but it is likely that the following observations will apply also to other countries.

Throughout this period the most important centres of learning continued to be those connected with the church: the parish and grammar schools, the musical and choir schools, the colleges and the universities. Alongside these were centres of professional and administrative activity (increasingly staffed by laymen), where literary interests might be stimulated. One might think here of the English Privy Seal Office, in which the poet Thomas Hoccleve, admirer of Chaucer, worked; a Scottish example would be the College of Justice, established by King James V in 1532. The household, by way of contrast with these examples, was an institution neither explicitly ecclesiastical nor professional, nor was it necessarily organised on the basis of rules or statutes (albeit that the royal household had evolved a definite structure of offices). The household,

rather, acquired its dynamism from a combination of ancient custom and prevailing social norms. As an instrument of social cohesion the family household distinguished itself by the way it privileged relations between the sexes, and we shall see that the female members of the family were of no small importance for the learning which was carried on within the household.

The smallest form of household was that of the family. By this we should not think of the small, nuclear family of today, but rather of the extended families common in countries around the Mediterranean and parts further south. This larger unit is known to social historians as the 'stem family', and it is characteristically made up of members drawn from three or more generations, all under one paterfamilias.<sup>1</sup> An idea of this kind of arrangement, as it happens, is given by Sir Thomas More, in his *Utopia* (1515-1516):

Each city, then, consists of households, the households consisting generally of blood-relations. When the women grow up and are married, they move into their husbands' households. On the other hand, male children and after them grand-children remain in the family, and are subject to the oldest parent, unless his mind has started to fail, in which case the next oldest takes his place. To keep the city from becoming too large or too small, they have decreed that there shall be no more than six thousand households in it (exclusive of the surrounding countryside), each family containing between ten and sixteen adults. They do not, of course, try to regulate the number of minor children in a family.<sup>2</sup>

At the other end of the social scale one might mention the household of the king, which was altogether more elaborate.

For his part, the minor sixteenth-century poet, George Cavenish, has provided a fascinating and detailed description of the household of a really grand person—namely, his patron, Thomas Wolsey, when the latter was at the height of his power, as Chancellor of England, Archbishop of York, and Cardinal, in 1530. There were three principal officers: a steward (always a doctor or a priest); a treasurer (a knight); and a controller (an esquire). In addition there were: a cofferer, three marshalls, two yeomen ushers; two grooms; and an almoner. In the hall kitchen there were: two clerks of the kitchen; one clerk controller; a surveyor of the dresser; one clerk of

---

<sup>1</sup> D. Herlihy, *Medieval Households* (Cambridge Mass./London 1985) 131-156.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Thomas More, *Utopia*, trans. and ed. Robert M. Adams (New York/London 1992, 2nd ed.) 40-41.

the spicery; two master cooks; twelve other labourers; a yeoman of the scullery; two yeomen of the silver scullery; two yeomen of the pastry; and two grooms. There were 106 further domestic functionaries. In Wolsey's chapel we find: the dean ('allwayes a great clerk & a devyn'); a subdean; a cantor; a gospeller; a 'pystoler'; twelve singing priests; the master of the children; twelve singing children, sixteen singing men; a servant for the children; a yeoman and two grooms of the vestry. There then follows a list of more than 200 officers.<sup>3</sup> In the same period the households of some privileged women likewise surprise by their size: an excellent example is that of Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby, and mother of Henry VII.<sup>4</sup>

Cavendish's extraordinarily detailed list shows that the dimensions of what one must understand by the concept 'household' can be surprisingly elastic. It also suffices to indicate the many possibilities for learning activity within the household: the singing children, for example, would have to be trained. One may presume that some of the clerks and churchmen in such a household would have been engaged in teaching of some sort, in addition to their spiritual duties. For tutors or chaplains an attractive aspect of the household was doubtless the way in which the household provided an excellent connection between the world of education and that of political power. Wolsey's own early career is a perfect illustration of this. He was born the son of a butcher in Ipswich, but was sent at an early age to study at Oxford. Thanks to his precocious intelligence he was able to graduate at the age of fifteen, thereby earning for himself the nickname of the 'boy bachelor'. He was appointed a Fellow of Magdalen College, and put in charge of the school there. Three pupils of Magdalen school at that time were the sons of the Marquess of Dorset; the latter was so impressed by Wolsey that he invited him to his own home, in order to become the tutor of his other children. As a result of this move, Wolsey received his first ecclesiastical benefice, and so was set on the road of preferment and promotion.<sup>5</sup> Another example of the household tutor is the poet John Skelton,

---

<sup>3</sup> G. Cavendish, *The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey*, ed. R.S. Sylvester, EETS Original Series 243 (London 1959) 19-20. Also: G. Cavendish, *Metrical Visions*, ed. A.S.G. Edwards (Columbia, SC, 1980).

<sup>4</sup> M.K. Jones, M.G. Underwood, *The King's Mother* (Cambridge 1992) Appendix 3, 268-287.

<sup>5</sup> Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey* (as in n.3) 4-5.

who was instructor at Eltham palace to the children of King Henry VII. It was to Eltham that Sir Thomas More brought Erasmus, on the latter's first visit to England, in 1499, and it was there that he presented the great humanist to the future Henry VIII, then aged eight.<sup>6</sup> The connection of Skelton with the king later came in useful, at the time of the poet's quarrel with Cardinal Wolsey.

Whereas both Wolsey and Skelton were professional tutors within aristocratic households, the poet Geoffrey Chaucer had no such occupation, although he was certainly a familiar face at court. Chaucer's entry to grand circles occurred when he became a page in the household of Elizabeth, Countess of Ulster, wife to Prince Lionel, the second son of King Edward III. The role of the page was not an exalted one, but such a person had to learn the routines of courtly behaviour, and would at the same time acquire a general education. Derek Pearsall describes Chaucer's education thus:

Education at court was not a formal and self-conscious activity, even though one of the household clerks might be given the task of knocking some Latin into the heads of the pages. There was no regular school or school hours, and a boy or girl (girls were as much part of the household as boys) learnt as much as he or she was willing and able to learn. A clerk who was a good scholar . . . could do a lot with a bright and eager pupil. So Chaucer had the chance to improve his Latin and to extend his knowledge of Latin literature while he was a page at court. He would also acquire, if he did not have it already, complete fluency in French, which was the language of formal or polite intercourse in the household, with English used more in off-duty moments. He would become familiar with French books of religious instruction and books of chivalric and courtly etiquette, and above all with the fashionable French love-allegories and romances, as well as with the somewhat less fashionable English romances. . . .<sup>7</sup>

Later on Chaucer became a valet in the King's service, and so got to know his future wife, Phillippa Roet, who was a member of the household of the Queen. Although Chaucer cannot be said actually to have been a courtier, he was closely involved, at least in his early career, with the court circles, and this environment provided him with a kind of education, at least in the school of life and courtly manners. Later in life, Chaucer moved away somewhat from the court,

---

<sup>6</sup> J. Ridley, *Statesman and Saint: Cardinal Wolsey, Sir Thomas More, and the Politics of Henry VIII* (New York 1983) 16.

<sup>7</sup> D. Pearsall, *The Life of Geoffrey Chaucer: A Critical Biography* (Oxford 1992) 40.

and the friends of his mature years—people like the poet, Gower and the philosopher, Strode—were of a more intellectual cast.

In the great households of the fifteenth century, learning activity and literary culture can be said to have been channelled in various ways. First, there was education in the essentials of courtly behaviour. Sir John Fortescue, in the late fifteenth century, described the royal household as ‘the supreme academy for the nobles of the realm, and a school of physical activity [*strenuitas*], behaviour [*probitas*], and manners [*mores*], by which the realm gains honour, flourishes, and is secured against invaders’.<sup>8</sup> In the late Middle Ages, large numbers of works of instruction were composed for those engaged in this kind of lifestyle:<sup>9</sup> in this context one might mention books on hunting (e.g. *The Master of Game*, c.1406) and on heraldry (e.g. *The Book of St Albans*, printed 1486).<sup>10</sup> As Pearsall has suggested, romances owed much of their popularity to this didactic urge. A poem such as *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* is not merely a superb story, but also a work which examines what the ideal knight should and should not do. Similar things may be said about the *Guy of Warwick* romances, as well as about those dealing with the Holy Grail.

A second area of education in the household concerns piety and religious instruction. In the royal and knightly class religion tended to be an affair for younger sons, who would not inherit the responsibilities of land and property; it was also the concern of daughters, wives and widows. It was common for high-class ladies to found religious houses, or to become the recognised patrons of already existing houses. Nor should one overlook the role played by women in the founding of academic colleges: for example, Clare Hall, Cambridge, received its statutes in 1359, through the efforts of Lady Elizabeth de Burgh, and Pembroke Hall, also at Cambridge, owed its financial establishment to Marie de St Pol, second wife of Aymer de Valence, Earl of Pembroke.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Quoted in: Chr. Given-Wilson, *The English Nobility in the Late Middle Ages* (London/New York 1987) 4. See also: idem, *The Royal Household and the King's Affinity* (New Haven/London 1986) Appendix III, ‘The staff of the household 1353-1406’.

<sup>9</sup> N. Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530* (London/New York 1984) 216.

<sup>10</sup> *The Master of Game* [etc.], ed. W.A. and F. Baillie-Grohman (London 1909); *The Boke of St Albans*, ed. W. Blades (London 1881).

<sup>11</sup> J.C. Ward, *English Noblewomen in the Later Middle Ages* (London 1992) 158-159.



Towards the end of the Middle Ages, however, humanistic culture began to have an impact upon this pattern of learning. In medieval society the heads of the household (the lord and lady) did not have learning as their first aim in life, and even after the rise of humanism this would remain so in the great majority of households. From the end of the fifteenth century, however, we find cases in which the head of the household is distinguished by intellectual pursuits. For obvious reasons, this tended to happen not with great landowners but among the representatives of the professional class. Some of the latter might be of humble background, such as Erasmus and Cardinal Wolsey; others, like Sir Thomas More, might have the advantages of (reasonable) wealth and position behind them; still others, like Sir Richard Maitland of Lethington, might come from the minor gentry, and rise to social prominence through the exercise of their profession (Maitland was a judge). A very few distinguished humanists—such as Petrarch, Montaigne and Pico della Mirandola—were in a position to devote themselves completely to their studies. Several monarchs, even, began to engage in intellectual activity—one obvious example being Henry VIII of England, in 1521 given the title of ‘fidei defensor’ by Pope Julius II, in recognition of his contribution to the theological debates provoked by Luther. In many ways the young Henry VIII must have seemed to personify the ideal of the Platonic philosopher-king. Rulers of this kind, following Burgundian practice,<sup>12</sup> liked to show their magnificence by attracting intellectuals to their courts, and some even submitted themselves to instruction from scholars. Mary Queen of Scots, for example, studied Livy and other Latin classics under the guidance of George Buchanan, and the great humanist poet (who had earlier been the schoolmaster of Montaigne) subsequently became the tutor of the youthful King James VI.<sup>13</sup> These cases display the general trend, characteristic of the Renaissance, towards the intellectualisation of the household.

Such changes were of profound significance for the role of the household as a centre of learning. Whereas formerly the household had basically provided the general environment within which learning might (or might not) occur, now the household itself could

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. G. Kipling, *The Triumph of Honour: Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance* (Leiden 1977) 8-30.

<sup>13</sup> I.D. McFarlane, *Buchanan* (London 1981) 93-95, 207.

become a focus and catalyst of scholarship. As one historian of education in the period has written:

What separated the fourteenth—and fifteenth-century aristocracy from their Tudor and Stuart successors was not a lack of education but a lack of consciousness about it. This arose from the nature of medieval education, which was less distinct from life in general than it has since become.<sup>14</sup>

Many households in the time of the Renaissance display this growing detachment from 'life in general'. By way of illustration, the families of Sir Thomas More and Sir Richard Maitland, the one English the other Scottish, will be used.

One novel aspect of the new type of Renaissance household is the possibility of close intellectual contact between the generations; this meant that many children of the same family, and not merely the one son intended for the priesthood, might be expected to take an active interest in learning and literary culture. Another novelty is the education of the daughters of the household to a high level of competence in Latin—the precondition of literary culture, and hitherto virtually the exclusive prerogative of males. A consequence of this was the increased importance of the son-in-law within the household, since educated daughters would be likely to opt for cultured husbands. Moreover, in certain households intelligent, but impecunious, young women might be adopted as companions-in-learning for studious daughters. Nor must one overlook a further stimulating factor: the coming and going of learned friends of the head of the family. Such persons might be said to play within the household a role akin to that of cultural ambassador; in this respect the household of the scholar might reflect, albeit on a small scale, the pattern of the royal household with all its stream of political ambassadors. One family friend, who visited the More household on several occasions, was the great Erasmus, and another was the artist, Hans Holbein, who made a drawing of the household as a group, as well as sketches of several of its individual members. The analogy between the domestic household and the state was, indeed, insisted upon in Lutheran theology, where the authority of the head of the household was declared to be absolute, and where parents were

---

<sup>14</sup> N. Orme, *Education and Society in Medieval and Renaissance England* (Hambleton/Ronceverte 1989) 174.

enjoined to function as bishops towards their children.<sup>15</sup> Another aspect of significance is the fact that family households might maintain a pattern of learning and culture which would extend over several generations. Families which first established their role in society through their learning and professional skills, would henceforth be likely to maintain themselves in such positions, from which, indeed, they might expect to rise still higher in social status.

Sir Thomas More's grandfather was a butler at Lincoln's Inn, part of the law courts in London; his father was a High Court judge; More himself became a judge, and eventually Lord Chancellor of England. Here we see the typical rise of a professional family through several generations. More's daughter, Margaret, was an excellent scholar; she was taught Latin and Greek by her father, and she composed poetry in these languages. Margaret More enjoyed a particularly close intellectual relationship with her father, who fully appreciated her accomplishments. One of these was her translation into English of Erasmus's treatise on the Lord's Prayer. The introduction to this book, by Richard Hyrde, who was a friend of Sir Thomas, has been called 'the first Renaissance document in English on the education of women'.<sup>16</sup> It seems entirely appropriate that, when More sent letters to his children, he addressed them collectively as his 'whole schoole'.<sup>17</sup> Margaret More married William Roper, a barrister, who was to write one of the several early biographies of Sir Thomas. More's sister, Elizabeth, married John Rastell, lawyer, printer and Renaissance dramatist. Their daughter, also called Elizabeth, married John Heywood, also a dramatist, while the other children became Jesuits. The son of this latter Elizabeth was none other than the Metaphysical poet, John Donne.

Several accounts exist of the academic style of life in the More household. Sir Thomas's great-grandson, Cresacre More, described it thus:

You would say there were in that place Plato's Academie; but I do the house iniury in comparing it to Plato's academie, wherein there was

---

<sup>15</sup> G. Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning* (Baltimore/London 1978) ch. 6, 'Pedagogy and the Family', 108-131.

<sup>16</sup> E.M.G. Routh, *Sir Thomas More and his Friends: 1477-1535* (London 1934) 134.

<sup>17</sup> C. More, *The Life and Death of Sir Thomas Moore* (Douai 1630; repr. Menston 1971) 173.

only disputations of numbers and Geometricall figures, and sometimes of morall vertues. I should rather call his howse a schoole or vniuersitie of Christian religion; for there is none therein but readeth or studieth the liberall Sciences; their speciall care is pietie and vertue; . . .<sup>18</sup>

Earlier, in a well-known letter of September 1521, addressed to Guillaume Budé, Erasmus expressed his admiration of More's manner of educating his children, especially the daughters; indeed, More's example had opened the eyes of Erasmus to the general desirability of instructing the female sex:

All of them from their earliest years he has had properly and strictly brought up in point of character, and has given them a liberal education. To his three daughters he has added a fourth girl, whom he maintains as a piece of generosity to be a playmate for them . . . This charming group, with the husbands of two of them, he keeps under his own roof. There you never see one of the girls idle, or busied with the trifles that women enjoy; they have a Livy in their hands.<sup>19</sup>

One could scarcely hope for a better illustration of the functioning of the domestic household as a centre of learning.

Less well known is Sir Richard Maitland of Lethington, a minor laird in sixteenth-century Scotland, who became a judge of the Court of Session. He is the author of an interesting corpus of poetry, often containing moral advice for his son, warning him against the evil ways of the court.<sup>20</sup> Maitland wrote a history of the Seton family, Catholic supporters of the Francophile Mary Queen of Scots, and by marriage Maitland was related to the Setons.<sup>21</sup> The three sons of Sir Richard composed poetry in Latin and Scots, and so did at least one of his daughters, Mary, who was responsible for collecting and copying out her father's writings in a famous poetry anthology, the

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibidem 120-121. On the same subject see also R.W. Chambers, *Thomas More* (London 1935) 175-191.

<sup>19</sup> *Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol. VIII: *Correspondence: Letters 1122 to 1251*, trans. R.A.B. Mynors, ed. P.G. Bietenholz (Toronto 1988) 296 (no.1233). For the original text: *Opus Epistolarum Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P.S. Allen, 12 vols. (Oxford 1906-1958).

<sup>20</sup> *The Poems of Sir Richard Maitland, of Lethingtoun, knight* [etc.], ed. J. Bain, Maitland Club (Glasgow 1830); A.A. MacDonald, "The Poetry of Sir Richard Maitland of Lethington", *Transactions of the East Lothian Antiquarian and Field Naturalists' Society* 13 (1972) 7-19.

<sup>21</sup> Sir Richard Maitland of Lethington, knight, *The history of the house of Seytoun to the year MDXIX* [etc.], ed. J. Fullarton, Maitland Club (Glasgow 1829).

so-called Maitland Quarto Manuscript.<sup>22</sup> One of the earliest country-house poems in English literature takes as its subject the home of Sir Richard, which is said to be a second Mantua. This work is written by one of Maitland's children, and resembles a Latin effusion on the same theme written by his precocious son, Thomas.<sup>23</sup> It is very appropriate that this learned household should produce such a tribute to the family home.

Despite the fact that the role of the household as centre of learning is potentially a very large subject, the essential elements can be fairly easily summed up. To some extent the Renaissance household continued patterns of family structure and social dynamics evolved through the Middle Ages. In the age of humanism, however, we see that in certain households, particularly those of professionals (where lawyers were especially prominent), a new pattern of life emerged. The new type of household is normally smaller than the greatest medieval specimens, and prestige within it derives more from scholarship than from political or ecclesiastical power. In such family households, the pursuit of learning comes to occupy a central position, and unlearned members are consigned to a peripheral position. In many ways the family household as centre of learning, albeit as an informal centre, may be seen to complement such official institutions as church, school and university. To the humanists of the Renaissance, monasticism had lost most of the attraction which it might have had for earlier scholars, and Sir Thomas More's ultimate choice of lifestyle, his forsaking of the Charterhouse for the studious family circle, seems paradigmatic for the times.

---

<sup>22</sup> *The Maitland Quarto Manuscript*, ed. W.A. Craigie, STS (Edinburgh/London 1920). Note also: *The Maitland Folio Manuscript*, ed. W.A. Craigie, STS, 2 vols. (Edinburgh/London 1919-1927).

<sup>23</sup> *The Maitland Quarto MS* (as in n.22) 216-222; A.A. MacDonald, "The Sense of Place in Early Scottish Verse: Rhetoric and Reality", *English Studies* 72 (1991) 12-27(25); *Poems of Maitland* (as in n.20) 144-148.

## THE SCOTTISH CHAPEL ROYAL AS CULTURAL INTERMEDIARY BETWEEN TOWN AND COURT

THEO VAN HEIJNSBERGEN

In the fifteenth century, the Scottish royal court was unable to provide continuous cultural patronage, and its own sporadic instances of such patronage were frequently outstripped by the efforts of powerful noble families whose names are linked to many of the literary productions of the period. However, at the end of the century, James III (1460-1488) began to gather artists around him at court, and he sent painters and musicians abroad to increase their skills.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, James's patronage of these men seems to have been controversial; his alienated aristocratic subjects turned first on these royal favourites, many of whom were of a relatively obscure background, and, shortly afterwards, they dispatched their monarch as well (1488).<sup>2</sup> It is an apt illustration of James's cultural schemes *vis-à-vis* his rather less than independent political position that the single main dispute that has been identified as the occasion—though not the cause—of his downfall was his attempt to appropriate church livings that belonged to one of the powerful noble families in order to use them for a specifically royal purpose, the establishment of a Chapel Royal.<sup>3</sup> James aspired to be a truly modern sovereign over a nation that had its own cultural identity, an identity that would in its turn reinforce the reputation of the sovereign because it was closely tied up with the royal cause, and for that reason he wanted to erect

---

<sup>1</sup> Ch. Rogers, *History of the Chapel Royal of Scotland* (London 1882) xii-xxii.

<sup>2</sup> N. Macdougall, "The Sources: a Reappraisal of the Legend", in: J.M. Brown (ed.), *Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century* (London 1977) 10-32, neutralises many of the myths relating to this episode that have become mixed up with historical fact; see also R. Nicholson, *The Edinburgh History of Scotland. Vol. II: Scotland—The Later Middle Ages* (Edinburgh 1974) 502-505. In spite of these ambiguities, it is clear that James III had alienated himself from his nobility and must have relied to some extent on more obscure characters.

<sup>3</sup> N. Macdougall, "Crown vs Nobility: the Struggle for the Priory of Coldingham, 1472-1488", in: K.J. Stringer (ed.), *Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland* (Edinburgh 1985) 254-269; idem, *James III: a Political Study* (Edinburgh 1982) 231-232; idem, "The Struggle for the Priory of Coldingham, 1472-1488", *Innes Review* 23 (1972) 102-114; Rogers, *History* (as in n.1) xviii, xxiii, ccxvi.

a Chapel Royal, a semi-clerical body that would have both an internal function, providing entertainment and religious service for the court circle, as well as an external one, embodying the power and glory of the monarch during ceremonies of state, marriages, baptisms, royal entries and visits by foreign ambassadors and princes.

This desire ended in a puddle of blood; but his son, the one true Renaissance king of Scotland, had learnt his lesson well. Although James IV (1488-1513) changed a few details of his father's plan, he eventually did manage to erect a financially sound Chapel Royal (1501) in his own castle of Stirling. Stirling, an ancient capital of the kingdom, was the safest royal seat; it served as the formidable stronghold of royal widows and minors who sought refuge against powerful factions of nobles, and, once these minors had started their personal reign, Stirling provided the setting to which they would withdraw when they wished to get away from the world of politics in Edinburgh and enjoy the more unburdened aspects of court life instead. The Chapel Royal was a collegiate church, with a dean, a treasurer, a sacristan, and a chanter or precentor. All in all, it could employ sixteen canons as well as six boy choristers in training and, when in 1504 a papal bull added another ten canons to this number, there was a choir of thirty-two voices that could deal with intricate pieces of music such as the compositions of Robert Carver (c.1485-c.1568). Carver, canon of the Chapel Royal, is at last receiving scholarly attention; works like 'O Bone Iesu', Carver's astounding motet for nineteen voices, put the music of Scotland on a level with that of contemporary Europe and make it sufficiently clear why the Stewart kings made the Chapel Royal of Stirling an important focus of their patronage: it was a 'centre of excellence' that they could put to good private as well as public use.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> On the erection of the Chapel Royal, see Rogers, *History* (as in n.1) passim; J.G. Dalyell, *A Brief Analysis of the Abbey of Cambuskenneth, the Chapel Royal of Stirling, the Preceptory of St Anthony of Leith* (Edinburgh 1828) 47-58; D. Laing, "Historical Notices of the Provostry of Kirkheugh, St Andrews", *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 4 (1863) 76-86. On Carver, see D.J. Ross, *Musick Fyne. Robert Carver and the Art of Music in Sixteenth Century Scotland* (Edinburgh 1993); J. Purser, *Scotland's Music* (Edinburgh/London 1992) passim; I. Woods, "Towards a Biography of Robert Carver", *Music Review* 48/49 (1988) 83-101. The Scottish Chapel Royal was modelled on the English Chapel Royal of Edward IV, and what we know of the Scottish Chapel indeed reveals similarities with its English counterpart. One of James III's favourites was the Englishman William Rogers, who had been retained at the Scottish court by James III when he had come on an embassy from

The term 'collegiate church' may require some explanation. In late-medieval Scotland many lay patrons endowed chaplainries and, eventually, complete churches. This frequently meant that a large number of close relatives and friends of these patrons formed the 'collegium' of secular clerics that staffed these churches (hence the term 'collegiate').<sup>5</sup> Collegiate churches were thus an important catalyst in the secularisation of society, and the Chapel Royal was the ultimate collegiate church: its lay patron was the king, and, although divine service for the royal household was a main priority, the Chapel Royal obviously served many more political and cultural purposes. A stronger king than his father, James IV was able to rally support from those he ruled over, and he succeeded in making his own desires epitomise those of the nation: thus, the Chapel Royal became a truly national institution, its impact outweighing its cost and embodying an undivided Christian culture.

Unfortunately, James IV's aspiration to be a true Renaissance prince eventually led to his downfall; his ambitions made him rush headlong into death on the battlefield in 1513, and most of the leading members of the Scottish nobility and the church died with him. Although this was one of the most disastrous events that ever befell Scotland, his young son, James V (1513-1542), eventually managed to revive at least part of his father's brilliant court, with again the Chapel Royal as an important subject of attention. James V seems to have become desirous of an institution that could provide services at his Edinburgh palace of Holyrood similar to those of the Chapel Royal in Stirling, but instead of developing a full-scale Chapel Royal in Edinburgh the personnel and equipment of the Stirling Chapel Royal continued to be transported to Edinburgh whenever needed, forming "a perambulating bishopric in constant and

---

Edward IV, and he reputedly founded a school of musicians in Scotland: W. Dauney (ed.), *Ancient Scottish Melodies* (Edinburgh 1838) 106, 155-156, 167-168, 365-367; Macdougall, *Sources* (as in n.2) 28. Consequently, information on the English Chapel Royal may be used to fill in some of the gaps in our knowledge; for this, see W. Ullmann (ed.), *Liber Regie Capelle*, Henry Bradshaw Society vol. XCII (London 1961) 3, 8 (on the episcopal status of the dean) and 15 (on the number of singers), and notes 6, 26 and 29 below. The importance of the English Chapel as a courtly centre of learning is also indicated by R. Firth Green, *Poets and Prince-Pleasers. Literature and the English Court in the Late Middle Ages* (Toronto 1980) 86-88.

<sup>5</sup> See D.E. Easson, "The Collegiate Churches of Scotland", *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 6 (1938) 193-215; 7 (1941) 30-47.



personal attendance on the king and his entourage.”<sup>6</sup> Moreover, shortly after James V had started his personal reign in 1528, he spent considerable attention and money on building activities connected to Stirling Castle and Trinity College, a collegiate church just outside the town walls of Edinburgh. Another royal foundation (it was founded in 1460 by queen Mary of Gueldres, the mother of James III), Trinity College had attracted Burgundian and Flemish artists and art, notably the most famous painting made in pre-Reformation Scotland, the Trinity College altar-piece attributed to Hugo van der Goes. James V took a keen interest in Trinity College around 1530, and, like his grandfather, he granted plenary indulgences to those who visited Trinity College on the feast of the Holy Trinity, mainly in order to draw in the crowds to pay their respect to one of the finest and most sumptuous examples of Gothic architecture in Scotland.<sup>7</sup>

Although in these ways Trinity College and the Chapel Royal were a focus for various branches of the arts such as painting and architecture, music remained the central concern, and—since music and poetry often go hand in hand—with strong links to the world of

---

<sup>6</sup> Ullmann, *Liber* (as in n.4) vii, 18. James III and IV had used the same device: Rogers, *History* (as in n.1) xxvi-xxvii; *Compota Thesaurariorum Regum Scotorum: Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland* (Edinburgh 1877- . . .) vol.I, ccxxxii. For the coronation in 1540 of James V's queen, Mary of Guise, the vessels and furnishings were brought from the Chapel Royal of Stirling to the chapel of the royal palace of Holyrood near Edinburgh, where there was also a “sangstaris chalmers”, i.e. a singers' chamber: R.K. Marshall, *Mary of Guise* (London 1977) 79; H.M. Paton, *Accounts of the Masters of Work* (Edinburgh 1957) vol.I, 103. When Mary of Guise celebrated Yule in Edinburgh in 1554, she had the staff and relics brought from the Chapel Royal to Holyrood Palace (*Compota Thesaurariorum* [as above] vol.X, lx and 265). Finally, in the personal reign of James V's daughter, Mary Queen of Scots, “the transference to [Edinburgh] of the endowments of the Chapel Royal with its musical school would have involved changes difficult and inopportune. It was therefore not proceeded with”: Rogers, *History* (as in n.1) lxiii.

<sup>7</sup> J. Colston, *Trinity College and Trinity Hospital: A Historical Sketch* (Edinburgh 1896) vol.I, 29; J.D. Marwick (ed.), *The History of the Collegiate Church and Hospital of the Holy Trinity and the Trinity Hospital* (Edinburgh 1911) 26-30; idem, *Charters and Documents relating to the Collegiate Church and Hospital of the Holy Trinity and the Trinity Hospital* (Edinburgh 1871) 54-55; Royal Commission for Ancient Historical Monuments, Scotland, *An Investigation of the Ancient and Historical Monuments of the City of Edinburgh* (Edinburgh 1951) 36; D. McRoberts, “Notes on Scoto-Flemish Artistic Contacts”, *Innes Review* 10 (1959) 91-96; L.O. Fradenburg, *City, Marriage, Tournament. Arts of Rule in Late Medieval Scotland* (Madison/London 1991) 23-26; D. Wilson, *Memorials of Edinburgh in the Olden Time* (Edinburgh 1891, 2nd ed.) vol.II, 242; W. Pitcairn Anderson, *Silences that Speak. Records of Edinburgh's Ancient Churches and Burial Grounds* (Edinburgh 1931) 205; Ross, *Musick Fyne* (as in n.4) 7.

literature. Apart from Robert Carver, the name of John Fethy (c.1480-c.1568) should be mentioned here. Precentor or chanter of the Chapel Royal from 1545 to 1566, he had introduced “the curious new fingering and playing on organs” in Scotland in the 1530s.<sup>8</sup> Fethy wrote music as well as the words to match it, and he left a small body of religious poetry and love lyrics. One of his colleagues was Alexander Scott, who was presented with a Chapel Royal benefice in 1539 and who became the chief poet during the minority and reign of Mary Queen of Scots (1542-1567). Apart from his love lyrics, which exemplify a Scottish tradition of art song that was closely in touch with that of France, his ‘New Year Gift’ poem to Mary in 1562, a poem in the tradition of advice to princes, reveals a poet who was not only a metrically accomplished craftsman but also a writer who was acquainted with the political, religious and social nuances of Erasmian humanism and modern statesmanship.<sup>9</sup> Finally, many of the relatively few sixteenth-century Scottish poets whose names we know can be linked to the Chapel Royal. Thus, Alexander Kyd clearly fits in with Fethy and Scott; he was a Chapel Royal prebendary in the early 1530s, and his only extant verse appears side by side with that of Scott and Fethy in the Bannatyne Manuscript (1568), the most important literary manuscript of Middle Scots literature, in which the work of many of these poets has been preserved. Sir James Inglis, named by the contemporary poet David Lindsay in a list of poets of James V’s days, was chancellor of the Chapel Royal from 1515 to 1529; this same list includes Robert Galbraith, who was treasurer of the Chapel Royal from 1528 to 1532. Bishop Andrew Durie, named as a writer of verse in another list of poets as well as by John Knox, was presented with the treasury of the Chapel Royal in 1520. George Clapperton was a vernacular poet who was not only subdean of the Chapel Royal but also godfather of a sister of George Bannatyne, the copyist of the Bannatyne Manuscript. Finally, George Steill, another minor

---

<sup>8</sup> D.E.R. Watt, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ Medii Aevi ad annum 1638* (Edinburgh 1969, 2nd draft) 337; J. MacQueen (ed.), *Ballatis of Luve* (Edinburgh 1970) xxxi.

<sup>9</sup> On Scott, see H.M. Shire, *Song, Dance and Poetry of the Court of Scotland under King James VI* (Cambridge 1969) 44-66; MacQueen, *Ballatis* (as in n.8) xxxv-lvii; T. van Heijnsbergen, “The Interaction between Literature and History in Queen Mary’s Edinburgh: the Bannatyne Manuscript and its Prosopographical Context”, in: A.A. MacDonald, M. Lynch, I.B. Cowan (eds.), *The Renaissance in Scotland* (Leiden 1994).

courtly lyricist, and (possibly) William Stewart, whose lyrical output is only second in quantity to that of Alexander Scott, can also be associated with the Chapel Royal. All in all, it is remarkable how many of the small number of Scottish poets had solid links with the Chapel Royal, and Trinity College was also part of this network of culture and patronage: George Clapperton was its provost from 1540 to 1566.<sup>10</sup>

Institutions such as the Chapel Royal and Trinity College were also centres of learning in other areas. The Chapel Royal employed many men who enjoyed a distinguished clerical, legal or academic career, the most internationally acclaimed among them being the scholastic philosopher John Mair or Major (1467-1550). Having studied at Cambridge and Paris, he was treasurer of the Chapel Royal from 1509 to 1525; he taught, among other places, in Glasgow and St Andrews as professor of theology and in Paris at the Collège de Montaigu, and his *Historia Majoris Britanniae* (1521) was the first attempt at providing a complete history of Scotland. Among his pupils we find John Knox, the great Scottish Reformer, and George Buchanan, probably the most respected Latin poet and dramatist of his era.<sup>11</sup> Mair's successor as treasurer of the Chapel Royal was another former pupil, the above-mentioned poet Robert Galbraith. He was a highly respected philosopher and professor of law at the Collège de Coqueret in Paris, as well as the author of the *Quadrupertitum*, "one of the classics of late-scholastic logic",<sup>12</sup> and he later became a Senator of the Scottish College of Justice; moreover, he was in touch with other Scottish poets and humanists and with the

---

<sup>10</sup> On Kyd: *Registrum Secreti Sigilli Regum Scotorum: the Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland* (Edinburgh 1908-...) vol.II, in the "Index of offices" under 'Prebendary of Strathbrawin' and 'Prebendary of Are Sexto'; for Kyd's verse, see W. Tod Ritchie (ed.), *The Bannatyne Manuscript*, STS (1928-1934) vol.II, 242-245. On Inglis and Galbraith: D. Hamer (ed.), *The Works of Sir David Lindsay of the Mount*, STS (1931-1936) vol.I, 57, l.40; vol.III, 75; Watt, *Fasti* (as in n.8) 338, 339. On Durie: G.F. Black (ed.), *The Seuin Seages*, STS (1932) 2, l.26; D. Laing (ed.), *The Works of John Knox* (repr. Edinburgh 1895) vol.II, 261-262; Watt, *Fasti* (as above) 339. On Clapperton: Ritchie, *Bannatyne Manuscript* (as above) vol.I, cxliv; Watt, *Fasti* (as above) 359. On Stewart: MacQueen, *Ballatis* (as in n.8) xxxiv-xxxv; A.A. MacDonald, "William Stewart and the Court Poetry of the Reign of James V" (forthcoming).

<sup>11</sup> Watt, *Fasti* (as in.8) 339; I.D. McFarlane, *Buchanan* (London 1981) 2, 23-24.

<sup>12</sup> A. Broadie, *The Circle of John Mair. Logic and Logicians in Pre-Reformation Scotland* (Oxford 1985) 4. The full title of Galbraith's book: *Quadrupertitum in oppositiones conuersiones hypotheticas et Modales Magistri Roberti Caubraith omnem ferme difficultatem dialecticam enodans* (Paris 1510, repr. 1516).

literary circles that can be connected to the above-mentioned Bannatyne Manuscript, notably the translator and vernacular poet John Bellenden.<sup>13</sup>

The prebendaries and dignitaries of the Chapel Royal were, by virtue of their office, courtiers as much as academics, legists and clerics. They formed a group of well-educated Scotsmen who had more often than not received part of their education on the Continent; a prebend in the Chapel Royal or in another collegiate church frequently operated as a bursary to study abroad, and these students would import new insights and techniques on their return to Scotland. The latter applies to both Fethy and (probably) Scott. James Lauder, a musician under Mary Queen of Scots as well as James VI, provides another example: the son of a prominent burghess of Edinburgh, Lauder was a prebendary of the choir of St Giles in Edinburgh, another collegiate church, and as such he was in 1553 sent to England and France for a year “to the effect that he may haue and get better eruditoun in mvsik and playing nor [than] he hes.”<sup>14</sup> Such people—either as an informal group or in formalised bodies such as the Chapel Royal, the College of Justice or the royal household—fostered a climate in which contemporary intellectual debates and elements of a European, courtly-urban culture could be integrated in a national identity.

James IV's propagation at the turn of the century of a type of humanism that privileged legal reform and education had resulted in the rise of an increasingly powerful ‘middling’ class of citizens who,

---

<sup>13</sup> Watt, *Fasti* (as in n.8) 339. On the ‘humanist and literary circles’, see van Heijnsbergen, *Interaction* (as in n.9), which also provides additional details regarding the links between the Chapel Royal, Trinity College and the professional classes of Edinburgh.

<sup>14</sup> J.D. Marwick, M. Wood (eds.) *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh A.D. 1528-1557* (Edinburgh 1871) 176. James III (Rogers, *History* [as in n.1] xviii-xix) and James IV (I.B. Cowan, *The Scottish Reformation. Church and Society in Sixteenth Century Scotland* [London 1982] 12-13) also sent their ‘scolar minstrels’ abroad, among whom John Fethy. On the level of local collegiate churches we see that choristers were released with fee to study the organ and, should their voice break, they would pass to the local grammar school: J. Durkan, “Education in the Century of the Reformation”, in: D. McRoberts (ed.), *Essays on the Scottish Reformation 1513-1625* (Glasgow 1962) 147-148; as the Scottish Chapel Royal was modelled on its English counterpart (as indicated in n.4), it is interesting to know that the latter assigned its boy choristers a place at Oxford or Cambridge when their voices broke: *Compota Thesaurariorum* (as in n.6) vol.I, ccxxxiv. On the post-Reformation use of church benefices for musicians, see J. McQuaid, “Music and the Administration after 1560”, *Innes Review* 3 (1952) 14-21.

especially in Edinburgh, realised that their position was closely connected to that of their monarch, whose palace of Holyrood was, like Trinity College, located just outside the town walls. They had carved out their own niche of power especially through their service to the crown in administrative functions, such as those of writer at the law courts or clerk of the exchequer, and it was the offspring of these men that attended the 'little' or 'song school', an institution, separate from the grammar school, that was associated with collegiate churches. Analogous to the internal arrangement of the Chapel Royal, the song schools were originally primarily meant to train boys for service in the choir; for this purpose they combined the acquisition of a basic knowledge of music with a proficiency in reading and writing and in Latin, and it was in this way instrumental in bringing education from the monasteries to the town. Thus, St Giles had its own song school, where students were trained by, among others, former Chapel Royal prebendaries such as Fethy: apart from his Chapel Royal benefice, Fethy was also Master of the Aberdeen song school and, later, Master of the Edinburgh song school. Moreover, these men also passed on their skills in other capacities: Fethy was paid for tuning the organs of St Giles, of which he was also a prebendary, Kyd was subchanter of Aberdeen Cathedral from 1534 until 1563, and Scott in 1548 received a canon's portion of Inchmahome, an Augustinian priory not far from Stirling—another benefice in lay patronage, in this case that of Lord Erskine, the trusted, hereditary guardian of royal progeny—for "the decoir [adornment, honour] of our queir [choir] in musik and playing";<sup>15</sup> the Alexander Scott who received a pension for singing in the choir of St Giles in 1556 and again in 1558 is most likely to have been the same person.<sup>16</sup> Not only could clerics of a relatively modest background such as Fethy and Scott by virtue of their prebends gain access to and become part of a cultural and intellectual élite, but more and

<sup>15</sup> Shire, *Song, Dance and Poetry* (as in n.9) 260.

<sup>16</sup> Easson, *Collegiate Churches* (as in note 5) 204; Watt, *Fasti* (as in n.8) 17; MacQueen, *Ballatis* (as in n.8) xxxvii-xxxviii; van Heijnsbergen, *Interaction* (as in n.9). For a survey of the function and status of these 'little' or 'song schools', see Durkan, *Education* (as in n.14) 145-51; see also Cowan, *The Scottish Reformation* (as in n.14) 11-15. Apart from the song school of St Giles, Trinity College provided a similar centre of learning: none of its prebendaries "should be appointed unless he was capable of reading and singing in plain chant and descant. The boys or choristers also behaved to be capable of learning these," and prebendaries also had to be "learned in organs": Marwick, *History* (as in n.7) 17, 23.

more burgesses also joined this circle of (often bastard) sons of noblemen, clergymen and even royalty as a result of these social developments and networks of patronage. In institutions such as the Chapel Royal and Trinity College a sophisticated court culture met and mingled with its rising urban counterpart, the latter taking great pride in its collegiate churches whose song schools catered for primary education in an increasingly secularised society. Initially meant to staff the choir, these schools equipped their students for more than just song, and—in an era in which Edinburgh had neither a university nor Inns of Court—the song school provided one of the opportunities for the burgh to manifest itself as an increasingly important cultural patron.

A similar interaction between crown and town can be noted in Stirling, where the personnel of the Chapel Royal—notably Carver and Kyd—regularly transferred its services to the local parish church, only a few hundred yards away from the Chapel Royal in Stirling Castle. Moreover, Robert Carver appears as bailie of Stirling Town Council and as master of works, in charge of the construction and repair of—among other things—the parish church.<sup>17</sup> Permutations like these illustrate an increasing social mobility, but also the relative instability of the Scottish court, both political and financial, particularly under a minor monarch. After the death of James V, his widow, Mary of Guise, withdrew to Stirling and tried to preserve a united Scotland, opposing (in the French interest) the English attempts at making Scotland a satellite state. While in Edinburgh the head of the powerful Hamilton family, who had been appointed to rule the country, proved increasingly ineffective, Mary of Guise succeeded in putting an end to internal strife and made her court at Stirling Castle as magnificent a continuation of court culture as she could afford; at one stage it even produced its own coinage and summoned its own parliament. Scottish music and literature of this period show that a Francophile interest in culture and learning was cultivated in her circle, and the prominence of French part-song is a marked characteristic of Scottish music of this period.<sup>18</sup> In this period, Chapel Royal poets and musicians such as

---

<sup>17</sup> Woods, *Towards a Biography* (as in n.4) 89-93, 97-101.

<sup>18</sup> J.G. Mackay (ed.), *The Historie and Chronicles of Scotland*. . . by Robert Lindesay of Pitscottie, STS (1899-1911) vol.II, 15-17; *Comptota Thesaurariorum* (as in n.6) vol.VIII, lxiii, 308; A. Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses*

Fethy, Kyd and Scott were working within a social and intellectual context that was largely a compromise between a moderate or even tentatively reformist Catholicism and a society which, especially in the more urban areas, was open to Lutheran ideas; for example, Alexander Scott's social criticism in his 'New Year Gift' is remarkably balanced, and he also wrote some of the earliest psalms in Scots. Mary of Guise, however, alienated herself from many of her previous allies by responding insufficiently to the increasingly anti-French feelings of her subjects, and her reign ended with her defeat by the Reformers in 1560. The subsequent personal rule of her daughter, Mary Queen of Scots, who had spent the largest part of her youth in France, was a period of uneasy balance between reform-minded subjects and a Catholic, semi-French monarch. The Queen insisted on having mass, as a result of which there were great scuffles both in and outside the Chapel Royal shortly after her arrival in Scotland in 1561, when Protestant nobles disturbed the service and several priests and clerks ended up "with broken heads, and bloody ears";<sup>19</sup> at her Edinburgh palace, Mary had to rely on her household musicians to satisfy her great love of music. All this goes to show that after 1560 the context for Continental art-song had greatly narrowed, even though Mary's displays of courtly splendour in Renaissance style meant that Scotland still had glimpses of a Renaissance eloquence expressed in and through court ceremony and festivity. Having been crowned in the Chapel Royal of Stirling herself, Mary in 1566 staged the baptism of her own son, the future James VI of Scotland and James I of England, at the same place; witnessed by an impressive array of Scottish noblemen and foreign ambassadors, this was the most potent display of royal splendour that her reign was to produce, and it has been interpreted as part of a Catholic *risorgimento*.<sup>20</sup> However, Mary had to move carefully in

---

(Edinburgh 1850-1859) vol.II, 46ff. The period of 1542 to 1551 was a remarkably active period for the Chapel Royal at Stirling: Woods, *Towards a Biography* (as in n.4) 99. On the French part song: Ross, *Musick Fyne* (as in n.4) 44, 52, 124.

<sup>19</sup> G. Chalmers, *The Life of Mary, Queen of Scots* (London 1822, 2nd ed.) vol.I, 83.

<sup>20</sup> M. Lynch, "Queen Mary's Triumph: the Baptismal Celebrations at Stirling in December 1566", *Scottish Historical Review* 69 (1990) 1-21; Rogers, *History* (as in n.1) lxx-lxvi. The riches of the Chapel Royal can be gleaned from J. Robertson (ed.), *Inventaires de la royne descosse douairiere de France* (Edinburgh 1863), 184-186, showing that it was the centre of court entertainment.

a country in which institutions such as the Chapel Royal were dis-trusted by the Protestants as instances of Catholic idolatry, and it is interesting to see that Mary received a warning similar to that given to James III. She had enlisted an Italian, David Riccio, as the bass voice in her small private ensemble of singers at her Edinburgh palace, and she soon made him her secretary. The nobility expressed its resentment at the privileged position of this upstart, who had come to Scotland in the retinue of a Savoy ambassador, and Mary was given an explicit signal that she had transgressed a dangerous boundary when, one night in March 1566, Riccio was dragged out of the Queen's own private dining room by a large group of noble-men. He clung to the Queen's dress, but she could not prevent his being stabbed to death in front of her eyes; to underline the collective disapproval of her subjects, Riccio's body was stabbed some fifty to sixty times, and the dagger of the King, who was involved in the conspiracy, was significantly left in the wound it had caused in the body. Relations between Mary and her subjects became increasing-ly complex after this event, and sixteen months later she was forced to abdicate; the Chapel Royal in Stirling—which had escaped demo-lition in earlier periods due to the impregnable position of Stirling Castle—as well as Mary's private chapel at Holyrood Palace near Edinburgh were stripped of their furnishings, and it is significant that a year later her son, Scotland's new king, was crowned not at the Chapel Royal but at the parish church just outside Stirling Castle.<sup>21</sup>

In the early years of the reign of James VI (1567-1625) the domi-nant, Calvinist type of Protestantism in Scotland radically re-evalu-ated some of the aspects of the court-initiated early-Renaissance cul-ture of pre-Reformation Scotland; in doing so, it interfered with the continuation of a late-medieval interaction between royal, clerical and urban initiative that had made Scotland an autonomous nation within a European community. James VI's personal preferences, however, soon caused a collision between him and the more militant Protestants. In the sphere of music and culture, James reopened the Edinburgh song school in 1579; furthermore, being a poet himself,

---

<sup>21</sup> A. Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots* (repr. London 1989) 304, 413; Rogers, *History* (as in n.1) lxxv-lxxvii; D. McRoberts, "Material Destruction caused by the Scottish Reformation", in: D. McRoberts (ed.), *Essays* (as in n.14) 433 n.82; M. Lynch, *Scotland: A New History* (London 1992, 2nd ed.) 218.



in imitation of the French *Pléiade* he gathered around him a group of promising vernacular poets, the so-called Castalian Band, and he was even responsible for their poetical manifesto, *The Essayes of a Prentise in the Divine Art of Poesie* (1584).<sup>22</sup> Likewise, he tried to breathe new life into the Chapel Royal as an important element of court life. Its chief musicians now were the Hudson brothers from England, who were also charged with the redevelopment of the Chapel; it had been greatly neglected in the preceding decade, its benefices granted to “unqualifeit personis quha [who] nather ar skillit in the . . . arte of musik nor yit meanis in onywyis to proffite thairintill”.<sup>23</sup> These Hudson brothers were closely in touch with the main poet of James VI’s reign, Alexander Montgomerie (c.1545-1598), who still listed Alexander Scott as a contemporary, court-related poet in the 1580s. For the baptism of his first son, Henry, in 1594, James ordered the ruined Chapel Royal of Stirling to be replaced by a magnificent new one; however, whereas the Chapel Royal had formerly been a royal and national institution anchored firmly in clerical, academic and ‘temporal’ sympathy, it had by this time become an increasingly isolated royal initiative. The former prebendaries of the Chapel now frequently acted as household staff and in undercover operations for their sovereign rather than being in any way greatly involved with music and learning. Alexander Scott’s son, who was granted a Chapel Royal prebend in 1567 shortly before Mary Queen of Scots was forced to abdicate, served in the household of Mary when she was later imprisoned in England, and he was a source of trouble to the Protestant regime in Scotland in the 1570s. The above-mentioned James Lauder, who, as a laymen and musician, was presented to a chaplaincy of St Giles in 1566, was *valet de chambre* in Mary’s court in exile, where his bastard son John was personal attendant and musician to Mary and bore secret messages for her. Finally, Alexander Montgomerie was suspected of spying for foreign, Catholic powers, and James VI,

---

<sup>22</sup> With the post-Reformation restrictions on the mass and the liturgy, collegiate churches and song schools had lost their *raison d’être*, and in England, as in Scotland, the Reformation curtailed the number of song schools: see P. Le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England, 1549-1660* (London 1967). To the reopening of the Edinburgh song school we owe the theoretical treatise *The Art of Music* (1580): Purser, *Scotland’s Music* (as in n.4) 113; Ross, *Musick Fyne* (as in n.7) 96-97.

<sup>23</sup> Records of the Lord Advocate’s Department, Scottish Record Office AD 1/142, 5 June 1586; see also McQuaid, *Music* (as in n.14) 19.

who wrote a warm epitaph on this fellow poet, had to intervene when the ministers of Edinburgh tried to prevent a proper burial of Montgomerie in 1598.<sup>24</sup>

When James VI became James I of England in 1603, his court moved to London. Apparently not over-eager to return to Scotland, his one and only visit to his native soil occurred in 1617. He commanded the chapel of his Edinburgh palace—now officially the Chapel Royal—to be repaired in order that he could worship in it, but no native workmen could be trusted to carry out this task and, instead, James employed craftsmen from England; when the Edinburgh citizens found out that a pair of organs and gilded statues of the twelve apostles were involved, they protested fiercely. James finally gave in, but he got his revenge when, during his visit, he enforced the Episcopal form of worship and made the Scottish nobles take the communion kneeling in the Chapel Royal.<sup>25</sup>

The antipathy against institutions such as the Chapel Royal has to be seen in the light of contemporary conditions; Reformation Scotland was temperamentally ill-inclined and socially ill-equipped to endure the opulence of a self-perpetuating élite, and its censure was frequently self-defensive rather than aggressive. The special legal status of the Chapel Royal—all its prebendaries were subject to the dean of the Chapel Royal, and the dean immediately subject to the see of Rome—as well as the fact that the appointments of its prebendaries completely ignored any pastoral care did not fail to backfire on the foundation as a whole.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, as an earlier,

---

<sup>24</sup> On the 1594 baptism: Rogers, *History* (as in n.1) lxxix-lxxxi; in 1583 the roof of the old Chapel Royal in Stirling Castle was so ruinous that the king could not worship in it 'in time of wet or rain': Paton, *Accounts* (as in n.6) xiv, 310. On Scott, see the present writer's thesis (forthcoming); on the Lauders, see Shire, *Song, Dance and Poetry* (as in n.9) 75-79 and Appendix II; Purser, *Scotland's Music* (as in n.4) 108, adds that the keyboard player William Kinloch was another such secret emissary. John Black, colleague and successor of Fethy as Master of the Aberdeen Song School, left Scotland for 15 years: Ross, *Musick Fyne* (as in n.7) 105, and C.S. Terry, 'Song School Notes: Historical Researches into Song Schools in England and Scotland', Aberdeen University Library MS 699. On Montgomerie: J. Durkan, 'The Date of Alexander Montgomerie's Death', *Innes Review* 34 (1983) 91-92.

<sup>25</sup> J. Harrison, *The History of the Monastery of the Holyrood and of the Palace of Holyrood House* (Edinburgh/London 1919) 173-177; James had finally moved the Chapel Royal to Holyrood in 1612 (207).

<sup>26</sup> F.C. Eeles, 'The Inventory of the Chapel Royal at Stirling, 1505', *Transactions of the Scottish Ecclesiological Society* 3 (1909-1910) 311; see also Ullmann, *Liber* (as in n.4) 3. Later, a similar legal exemption applied to the Senators of the College

Catholic reformer had pointed out, Scotland was musically over-educated to the neglect of other aspects of learning.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, in erasing many of its own cultural roots, the post-Reformation period cut off a vital part of Scotland's national identity, one which had been closely in touch with the latest European developments in many areas. It forced this late-medieval heritage to flee to a few isolated aristocratic houses away from Edinburgh, where it eventually etiolated.<sup>28</sup> As a result, the perception of Scotland's national past has become blurred; the break in continuity has led to a dislocation in national introspection that still perplexes many Scots when their cultural identity is at stake, and more awareness about centres of learning such as the Chapel Royal and other collegiate foundations may remedy this state of affairs. Within Scottish historiography there is an additional hurdle to be taken: the scarcity of material—lost or undeveloped—is still in many cases a given fact, or even a starting point. Consequently, with respect to this historical period a conception of 'learning' that only accepts as evidence for the

---

of Justice: *The Society of Writers to his Majesty's Signet* (Edinburgh 1936) 42. For these jurisdictional purposes, the Chapel Royal had a separate commissary, first noted in 1530: S. Ollivant, *The Court of the Official in Pre-Reformation Scotland* (Edinburgh 1982) 37; Watt, *Fasti* (as in n.8) 341. James IV petitioned the Pope to confer upon the dean not only the jurisdiction over the royal household, but also over churches in royal patronage and their parishioners and over all the palaces of his kingdom: D.E. Easson, I.B. Cowan, *Medieval Religious Houses* (London 1957, 2nd ed.) 227. Dalyell notes that "individuals who had been six months in the king's service were exempted from responsibility in any suits but those conducted before the dean of the Chapel Royal; for were they obliged to answer elsewhere in civil causes, this would interrupt their attendance on the king and queen": Dalyell, *A Brief Analysis* (as in n.4) 52, 58-59. On the lack of pastoral care, see G. Donaldson, "Galloway Clergy at the Reformation", *Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, Third Series 30 (1951-1952) 39-41.

<sup>27</sup> J. Durkan, "Education: the Laying of Fresh Foundations", in: J. MacQueen (ed.) *Humanism in Renaissance Scotland* (Edinburgh 1990) 125. It is interesting that this comment should come from Robert Richardson, an Augustine canon whose old teacher had been John Mair, and whose reform measures had been inspired by the example of the monastery of St Victor in Paris, thus combining the teaching of both monastic and secular centres of learning.

<sup>28</sup> In terms of music, Ross even speaks of this period of restriction of polyphony in Scotland, while the rest of Europe was experiencing high baroque, as a musical ice-age: *Musick Fyne* (as in n.4) 110; see also Purser, *Scotland's Music* (as in n.4) 123, 159. More revealing, perhaps, is the awkward self-mortification that James Melville, nephew of the Presbyterian leader Andrew Melville, inflicted on himself to exorcise his "amorous disposition" towards music, an example of the hyper-corrective quality of the post-Reformation reaction against music; as quoted in Purser, *Scotland's Music* (as above) 101.

existence of intelligence a large quantity of physical proof that establishes a formalised input of learning—such as curricula and textbooks—is too narrow and self-defeating; we know little about the actual textbooks of the Chapel Royal choristers, and, moreover, this was still an era in which learning was frequently still a matter of apprenticeship.<sup>29</sup> On the basis of the quality of the output, however, a high level of intellectual input can be posited. Thus, taken together, the Trinity college panel, Carver's music, Galbraith's *Quadrupertitum*, the poetry of Fethy and Scott and the architecture of Stirling Castle were facets of a larger whole, that of a late-medieval national and cultural identity; they are isolated phenomena in terms of their preservation, but not within a sixteenth-century context, and these instances of advanced skills can all be related—among several others—to one centre of knowledge in particular, the Chapel Royal. There exists a *History of the Chapel Royal of Scotland* (see note 1), but it was unable to develop greatly beyond an enumeration of facts; the buildings of Trinity College and James IV's Chapel Royal have been demolished; the music of Robert Carver was not properly performed and recorded in its entirety until the 1990s; Galbraith's book has not been reprinted since 1516; the Bannatyne Manuscript, containing the work of several of the poets related to the Chapel Royal, still awaits its first critical edition; and, finally, the attention to Middle Scots literature in the Scottish school curriculum is virtually nil. All this does no justice to an era in which the Chapel Royal—preserving, appreciating, stimulating, producing, communicating and disseminating music, literature and learning—stood self-confidently at the cross-roads of crown and town and of national and international cultural influences, with art and thought moving freely between these entities.

---

<sup>29</sup> Some information exists with regard to textbooks at song and grammar schools: Durkan, *Education* (as in n.14) 148, 152. The English Chapel Royal had a separate grammar master who took charge "not only of the education of the choirboys, but also of the children of those in the royal service": Ullmann, *Liber* (as in n.4) 16.



# ‘LIBERATION FROM THE TRIVIAL YOKE’: DUTCH RENAISSANCE EDUCATORS AND THEIR CULTURAL AND SOCIO-POLITICAL OBJECTIVES<sup>1</sup>

CATRIEN SANTING

Then, though I can only leave you a very small legacy, you owe me, your father, very much, since until now I have brought you up not only honest and decent, but for your education in both learning and morals I have committed you to educated men. Now death stands at my door, I wish to show you, my child, the right course of life: may you continue your way on this path under God's guidance. I close with a few remarks which should always be in your mind: concentrate with all the zeal you have on the arts which are called free and give more concern to your spirit than to your body. Since engagement in learning puts spurs to a youth and offers amusement in old age, it adorns times of happiness and during unhappiness it gives shelter and consolation. And because the spirit is far more excellent than the body, you must take care of it and evade ignorance, which is death to the spirit.<sup>2</sup>

These memorable words of his dying father were recalled by the Dutch schoolmaster Johannes Murmellius (c.1480-1517) in the preface of his *Didascalici libri duo*, a pedagogical introduction dating from the year 1510. The tone of this preface is very characteristic of Dutch humanism, which generally stressed the relation between learning and individual happiness as much as between learning and the well-being of society in general. The present article is a socio-cultural survey, by means of a selection of case studies, of the connection between humanism, the success of humanism, and the professionalisation of education on both a secondary school level as well as university level in the northeastern parts of the Late Medieval and Early Modern Netherlands. In this paper the internal aspects of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Quotation from a poem addressed to Alexander Hegius or the Münster teacher Fredericus Moorman, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 528 f. 206v: *Eiusdem ad ludimagistrum/ Solve iugum pueris trivio quicumque magister/ Apta doces Musis hoc tribuisse licet./ Langius hoc suadet, magnusque Ulsenius orat/ Hoc magne exposcunt ex helycone dee.*

<sup>2</sup> On Murmellius, see D. Reichling, *Johannes Murmellius. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Nebst einem ausführlichen Verzeichnis sämtlicher Schriften und einer Auswahl von Gedichten* (Freiburg i. Br. 1880, repr. Nieuwkoop 1963) *Didascalici*, Bibl. XXVI.

northern Dutch educational system will only be touched upon lightly. The essence is to show what points the teachers tried to make outside—or, to be more specific, beyond the limits of—their classrooms.

Subject and range have also to be defined in a geographical sense. The focus here will be upon schoolmasters who were mainly active in the northeastern parts of the present-day Netherlands. This area is formed by the most northerly of the territories controlled by the Burgundian duke (which in the late fifteenth century passed into the possession of the Hapsburgs) together with the adjacent German regions with which linguistically and culturally they formed a unit. These territories were prospering with respect to both economy and culture, and that explains why towns such as Zwolle, Groningen, Deventer and Münster could afford to maintain very good and advanced Latin schools and employed well-educated men for professional jobs such as school teacher, town physician or town clerk. Consequently, it is not surprising that many humanists earned their living in these northern areas.

Information on schools and education in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Netherlands is very meagre. Concrete facts concerning town administration are known only from a relatively late date, a problem which may explain why studies in the history of teaching have concentrated upon more recent periods. For our period there are only two comprehensive surveys of the educational system available. One on medieval schools by R.R. Post, and one on the humanistic-inspired educational reforms of the sixteenth century by Post's pupil P.N.M. Bot.<sup>3</sup> Both studies stem from the 1950s, while most of the existing biographical studies of Dutch educationalists are even older. The Nijmegen historians Post and Bot were very positive about the quality and quantity of Dutch schools in those days. Post tracked down educational institutions in all Dutch towns and in almost every significant village. Subsequently, he concluded that from the fourteenth century on, town authorities took care of the school buildings, determined the school order and appointed the *rectores*. In some cities the population of the Latin schools grew very large. During the decades after 1400, St Michael's School at Zwolle counted, for instance, up to 1000 pupils. Later in the century, Zwolle's leading position was taken over by Alexander Hegius's

---

<sup>3</sup> R.R. Post, *Scholen en onderwijs in Nederland* (Utrecht/Antwerpen 1954); P.N.M. Bot, *Humanisme en onderwijs in Nederland* (Utrecht/Antwerpen 1955).

school of St Lebuin at Deventer, whereas in the sixteenth century the grammar schools of Münster under Kemener and Murmellius and that of Groningen under Praedinius were the most successful.<sup>4</sup> The just named city schools were noted for an extensive educational programme: they were equipped with two extra classes—a *prima* and a *secunda*—that offered the basis of the university *artes* curriculum. In fact, for the purposes of our discussion, only this type of school is relevant, since in their last classes university graduates were usually in charge, and it is especially among their ranks that we find many devotees of the new humanistic movement.

Humanism had some difficulty in passing the Alps, and thus its acclimatisation process in the cool kingdom of Boreas took some time.<sup>5</sup> In the North, scholasticism had taken root very firmly. Besides, the new humanistic train of thought lacked the stimulus which had been crucial to its success in Italy: inspiration from the famous Roman past of the fatherland. Despite the fact that the Low Countries were relatively heavily urbanised, in the northern area under discussion elements of civic humanism played a modest role, since in the North secular princes and the church were much more powerful than in Italy. Humanism was in fact imported by arts graduates from the German universities, who had continued their education in Italy: Rudolf Agricola and his friends became acquainted with the classics at Ferrara, Bologna, Padua and Pavia. At those places they mastered the pure, Classical Latin language, and from that point of departure, they learned how to compose poetry, how to use the ancient rhetoricians for building up a good diction and how knowledge could benefit both wisdom and happiness.

From the 1460s and 1470s onwards, traces of the new Italian-style erudition can be found, since *carmina* were published, *epistolae* edited, *orationes* delivered, while teachers like Alexander Hegius made a start with reforming the school curriculum. However, during the fifteenth century these constituted merely hesitant beginnings. Only after the turn of the century, and thanks to a large-scale remodelling

---

<sup>4</sup> On the Latin school of Zwolle, see M. Schoengen, *Die Schule von Zwolle von Ihren Anfängen bis zu dem Auftreten des Humanismus* (Freiburg i. Br. 1898); J. Frederiks, *Ontstaan en ontwikkeling van het Zwolse schoolwezen* (Amsterdam 1959-1960).

<sup>5</sup> For a general survey, see J. IJsewijn, "The coming of humanism to the Low Countries", in: H.A. Oberman, Th.A. Brady Jr. (eds.), *Itinerarium Italicum. The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations*, dedicated to Paul Oskar Kristeller (Leiden 1975) 193-301.



of the educational system, did the conversion of the urban patriciate materialise. Humanism then spread into full bloom.

In essence, Dutch humanism was linguistically based: the mastering of the Classical Latin language was of primary importance, since it allowed other goals to be pursued subsequently. This bias made the quality of the teachers very important: it was up to them to metamorphose stubborn schoolboys into the new species of fluent and proficient *poetae eruditi*.

Towards the end of the Middle Ages, teaching, like many other occupations, went through a process of professionalisation. As a result, most of the headmasters and the teachers of the senior forms came to hold a university degree. They were at least *magister artium*, but we also discover notaries, medical doctors and priests among school leaders. A medical degree, for instance, gave access to a diversity of jobs: the humanist Gerard Listrius (1480-1522) obtained his doctorate in medicine at Pavia in 1514.<sup>6</sup> Next, Listrius was appointed headmaster of the Zwolle Latin school, where, accidentally, his medical background caused him much trouble. That is to say, in 1517 it was rumoured that he had poisoned his competitor Johannes Murmellius.

One can sum up these social changes as follows: society had become increasingly professionalised, hence physicians, notaries, judges, lawyers, town clerks and school teachers were supposed to have a master's or doctor's degree. This development, however, cannot be put on a par with specialisation. More likely there was a growing interaction between study and occupational duties, and this would lead to professional or social climbing.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, an academic title could not be valued too highly; birth and property still achieved much more than mere qualification, but graduation rendered something extra and could be the starting point for an upwardly mobile career.

---

<sup>6</sup> On Listrius, see P.G. Bietenholz, Th.B. Deutscher (eds.), *Contemporaries of Erasmus. A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and the Reformation*, 3 vols. (Toronto 1985-1987) vol.2, 335-336, and the literature cited there.

<sup>7</sup> For the relation between learning, professionalisation and status, see G. Grimm, *Literatur und Gelehrtentum in Deutschland. Untersuchungen zum Wandel ihres Verhältnisses vom Humanismus bis zum Aufklärung* (Tübingen 1983); K. Wriedt, "Bürgertum und Studium in Norddeutschland während des Spätmittelalters", in: J. Fried (ed.), *Schulen und Studium im sozialen Wandel des Hohen und Späten Mittelalters* (Sigmaringen 1986) 487-525.

During the late Middle Ages, universities attracted more and more students. The mass of students, nonetheless, did not proceed beyond the arts faculties, since only those with an urban, wealthy, or noble background could afford to prolong their studies over a longer period. It was normal for *pauperes*, or students from humble origin, to go to one of the nearby regional universities, and to attend classes for merely a couple of years. Arts graduates of low birth often ended up with teaching jobs, and thus we find many of them in charge of the *prima* and the *secunda* of high school.<sup>8</sup> Johannes Murmellius is a typical example of such a line of career. As we know, he came from a very common background. After having completed his licentiate, Murmellius was forced to leave the university of Cologne—in Murmellius's own words: *compulsus alios docere, dum ab aliis mallet discere* (I was forced to teach others, while I would have preferred to learn from others).<sup>9</sup> Thanks to exterior financial support, he managed to return a short time later, and then quickly obtained his master's degree, which indicates that a graduation was probably conditional for promotion. By comparison, it says much that the Deventer teacher Bartholomew of Cologne (about whom I shall say more below) was repeatedly insulted and passed over because he lacked an academic title.<sup>10</sup>

For the main part of this paper four *ludimagistri* have been selected, two from the first generation of humanist teachers, and two pedagogues who were active after the turn of the century. The first pair is the Deventer combination of Alexander Hegius and Bartholomeus Coloniensis, whereas the second consists of their pupils Gerard Listrius and Johannes Murmellius, who in later life met again at St Michael's school at Zwolle.

The Westphalian Hegius was born around 1440, and studied the arts at Rostock, where he took his master's degree in 1463.<sup>11</sup> After

---

<sup>8</sup> For the course of study and the careers of graduates, see H. de Ridder-Symoens (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe*, I. *Universities in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1991), esp. chapters VII ('Student education, student life' by R.Ch. Schwinges) 195-243 and VIII ('Careers of graduates' by P. Moraw) 244-278.

<sup>9</sup> Reichling, *Murmellius* (as in n.2) 24 n.1.

<sup>10</sup> Butzbach, *Odeporicon. Zweisprachige Ausgabe*, ed. A. Beniger (Weinheim 1991) 299; cf. Bot, *Humanisme en onderwijs* (as in n.3) 121-122.

<sup>11</sup> On Hegius, see F.J. Worstbrock, 'Hegius', in: K. Ruh (ed.) *Verfasserlexikon. Die Deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters* (Berlin 1981) III, 572-577, and the literature cited there.

having served for some time in his native area, he was appointed headmaster of St Lebuin's school at Deventer. Until his death in 1498, Hegius was highly successful in educating young people. Rudolf Agricola was a close friend of the rector of St Lebuin's school; it was he who turned the interests of Hegius towards humanism and he even managed to teach him some Greek.<sup>12</sup> In co-operation with his assistants, Johannes Synthen and Bartholomeus Coloniensis, and his landlord, the Deventer printer Richard Paffraet, Alexander Hegius gave the initial impetus to humanist inspired educational reform in the Netherlands.

The majority of Hegius's writings were meant to support daily work in the classroom. Together with Synthen, therefore, he produced a commentary on Alexander de Villadei's *Doctrinale*.<sup>13</sup> During his entire rectorate, this grammar remained on the curriculum of Hegius's school, which implies that the Deventer headmaster was not a radical reformer, but an advocate of slow changes. Nevertheless, Hegius was at the same time convinced that linguistic usage could best be trained on the basis of texts of the original authors.<sup>14</sup> In the classroom, dialogues were considered the most suitable exercise for the pupils, so Alexander Hegius wrote a couple of useful colloquies. These concern dialogues on religious, moral or philosophical themes, such as the three parts of the soul, the incarnation or idleness, which were supposed to be appropriate for youngsters.<sup>15</sup>

Hegius's poetical *oeuvre* is completely in tune with his pedagogical and religious views. Half of the poems are dedicated to either Christ, Mary, or various saints, whereas the nature of the other half is equally moral in tone and content: discussing vices and virtues, the ideal of the *aurea mediocritas*, the beauty of the Greek language and the service of the Muses. I suspect that even these poems were partly

---

<sup>12</sup> On their relationship, see R.J. Schoeck, "Agricola and Erasmus; Erasmus' inheritance of Northern Humanism", in: F. Akkerman, A.J. Vanderjagt (eds.), *Rodolphus Agricola Phrisius (1444-1485). Proceedings of the International Conference at the University of Groningen 28-30 October 1985* (Leiden 1988) 181-188.

<sup>13</sup> *Prima pars grammatices regulis et exemplis earundem compendiose noviter collecta* (Deventer, Richard Paffraet, 1495) and *Secunda pars* . . . (Deventer, Richard Paffraet, 1495). Cf. Post, *Scholen* (as in n.3) 146-147.

<sup>14</sup> J. IJsewijn, "Alexander Hegius †1498. *Invectiva in modos significandi*", *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 7 (1971) 299-318.

<sup>15</sup> These are published in different combinations and in several editions; see for a survey: Worstbrock, *Hegius* (as in n.11) 575 (1. *Dialogi*).

meant for usage in school. The themes are not only very proper, but on each occasion the poet declares in a very 'schoolmasterly' way which kind of metre he has applied in his verses.

Only two specimens from the collected poems, which were published under the title *Carmina gravia et elegantia* (and edited by his pupil Jacob Faber) have a slightly different tone.<sup>16</sup> They exalt the mighty town of Deventer. The epigram printed on the title page of the small volume tells us that Deventer is famous because of her righteous administration of justice and her abundant richness, which is well deserved. Thanks to all her money, the city could pay the soldiers who protected her, and thus the poet offers to pray day and night that the public treasury will always stay filled with coins. A second poem scolds the Black Death for causing the city so much pain.<sup>17</sup> Hegius is particularly concerned about the effect the plague has had on towns like Deventer, which are too worthy, too much praised, too radiant, to be damaged by such a sordid illness. The poet accordingly ends with an appeal to God to spare the clerics, the schoolmasters and the numerous merchants of Deventer by chasing away this injurious pestilence.

My second candidate is Bartholomew of Cologne, Hegius's assistant, who, after his tenure at Deventer, taught at Alkmaar and Minden.<sup>18</sup> Bartholomew did not have the advantage of a formal education, since he never attended a university. It is probable that he stayed on at Deventer having finished school there. Despite these assumed omissions in his training, this teacher was very erudite and far more versatile than his headmaster Alexander Hegius. Apart from some Latin exercises and an introduction to Peter of Spain's handbook of logic, he published a few scientifically-minded texts on the philosophy of Diogenes, on the calendar and on the various parts of the world and their dimensions. In the early 1490s there appeared a much-praised collection of poetry by his hand, entitled *Silva Carminum*.<sup>19</sup> Through this volume the poet presented himself successfully

---

<sup>16</sup> A. Hegius, *Carmina et gravia et elegantia cum ceteris eius opusculis que subiiciuntur* (Deventer, Richard Paffraet, 1503) titlepage and f. 33, D II r. (NK no.1041).

<sup>17</sup> On this poem, see Butzbach, *Odeporicon* (as in n.10) 284-287.

<sup>18</sup> On Bartholomew of Cologne, see IJsewijn, *The Coming of Humanism* (as in n.5) 233; Bietenholz, *Contemporaries* (as in n.6) and literature cited there.

<sup>19</sup> Bartholomeus Coloniensis, *Silva Carminum* (Deventer, Jacobus de Breda, 1491).

to the *respublica litteraria*, by showing off his broad knowledge of literature, astrology and mythology.

For our theme, however, it is a little surprising that Bartholomew's religious poetry is the most interesting part of his *oeuvre*. For here we find a combination of piety and local patriotism, as in the hymns that his Alkmaar pupils had to sing on the feast of this town's patrons St Matthew and St Lawrence, which are pervaded with reverence towards his employer, the town of Alkmaar.<sup>20</sup> This is how proper civic virtues and decent attitudes were imparted to schoolboys. At some time, therefore, the attendant Alkmaar senate must have listened approvingly to the lines that were being sung by the juvenile voices.

Around 1516, Bartholomew of Cologne composed a long poem of 344 hexameters on the relic of the Holy Blood at the Alkmaar church of St Lawrence.<sup>21</sup> It tells the story of a man called Folkert, who after a life full of crime and other sins, tried to become a priest. At his ordination, appropriately, the wine of the mass refused to enter his mouth and was spilled instead on Folkert's chasuble. The resulting bloodstained pieces of cloth developed into an important relic, which was to cure many people and bring wealth and peace to Alkmaar. The poem not only stands as a warning to the citizens of Alkmaar not to neglect the town's religious treasure, but also functions as an advertisement, since this piece of poetry extols the power of the relic and points out the possibility of a beneficial pilgrimage to Batavia's most northern town.

Hegius and Bartholomew of Cologne are typical illustrations of the first generation of humanist teachers, inasmuch as their former pupils Listrius and Murmellius, whose professional lives spanned the years between 1500 and 1520, held similar positions in the second generation. Johannes Murmellius was extraordinarily active

---

<sup>20</sup> On Coloniensis and Alkmaar, see C.P.H.M. Tilmans, "De Hollandse kroniek van Willem Hermans ontdekt. Een Egmondse codex uit ca. 1514", in: G.N.M. Vis et al. (eds.), *Heiligenlevens, Annalen en Kronieken* (Hilversum 1990) 182-187; E.H. Rijkenberg, "De geschiedenis en de reliquie van het mirakel van het H. Bloed te Alkmaar", *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van het Bisdome Haarlem* 21 (1896) 321-397, esp. Bijlage III. On the poems: C.P. Burger, "Een monument uit de bloeitijd van den Alkmaarsche school", *Het Boek* 10 (1921) 36-39 ('De schoolzangen van Bartholomeus Coloniensis').

<sup>21</sup> See Rijkenberg, *De geschiedenis* (as in n.20) Bijlage III; Burger, *Een monument* (as in n.20) 36-40.

throughout his life as—in chronological order—assistant headmaster of the Münster cathedral school, rector of the Münster school of St Ludger, rector of the Latin school of Alkmaar, and teacher in Zwolle and Deventer. Deservedly, he has been called the most successful and prolific pedagogue of Dutch humanism, since no fewer than fifty items are listed in his bibliography.<sup>22</sup> Murmellius drew up completely new Latin grammars, whilst his own editions of Ancient and Renaissance authors found an even more ready market. In addition, he wrote theoretical pedagogic works, among which an *Enchiridion scholasticorum*, about desired requirements for schoolboys.<sup>23</sup> Within the limited scope of this paper it is impossible to discuss Murmellius's 160 poems, which are mostly on religious and moral themes, including many praises of the *artes liberales*. Aside from that kind of poetry, we find the usual hymns on local patrons, but we also find a few *laudes urbium*. Humanists would often address one another with panegyric or disapproving poems, and Murmellius too liked to practise this genre. Next to his colleagues and fellow humanists, he praised local and national dignitaries, such as the new bishop of Münster, Erich von Sachsen-Lauenburg,<sup>24</sup> and last but not least Charles V. The *Charoleia* involves a series of poems, which function together as a mirror of princes.<sup>25</sup> The pedagogue was very proud of the role of learning; as he remarked: *Saepe libri suadent ea, quae non ausit amicus* (books often tell you what friends don't dare to say). It was Murmellius's aim, therefore, to impart the love of virtue and justice to Charles who therefore had to be, *magnificus, prudens, fortis moderatus, amator iustitiae, castus, sapiens, amabilis, pius*. Only those qualities would proclaim the future emperor *pater patriae*.<sup>26</sup>

Probably because of an argument over a teaching post, Murmellius and Listrius became archenemies. Just before he died, Murmellius published a collection of depreciatory epigrams directed against

---

<sup>22</sup> On Murmellius, see Reichling, *Murmellius* (as in n.2); M.A. Nauwelaerts, "Joannes Murmellius. Roermond 1480–Deventer 1517", in: *Historische opstellen over Roermond en omgeving* (Roermond 1951) 201–234. Both authors give extensive bibliographical information. Cf. the publications listed by NK.

<sup>23</sup> *Opusculum de discipulorum officiis s. enchiridion scholasticorum* (Zwolle, Peter van Os, c.1505), NK no.1564; Reichling, *Murmellius* (as in n.2) X.

<sup>24</sup> *Panegyricus in praeconium Erici, episcopi Monasteriensis* (Cologne, Heinrich Quentell, 1509),

<sup>25</sup> *Charoleia* (Louvain, Dirk Martens, 1515), NK no.3556.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Reichling, *Murmellius* (as in n.2) 102–103.

his former colleague.<sup>27</sup> In 1517 rumours became so persistent that Listrius felt obliged to defend himself against the accusations of having poisoned Murellius, and he published a *Carmen in malas et venosas linguas*.<sup>28</sup> The much-discussed Gerardus Listrius was born in Rhenen, near Utrecht. After his student days, he worked for some time as a corrector for Frobenius at Basel, where he realised a commentary on Erasmus's *Moriae Encomium*.<sup>29</sup> In 1516 Listrius was appointed rector of St Michael's in Zwolle, but soon had to leave this town because of a conflict with the local Dominicans over the question of the Reformation.<sup>30</sup> Sometime after the year 1522 Gerard Listrius's life met a rather inglorious end at the city of Amersfoort.

Listrius's *oeuvre* resembles that of Murellius, although his talents seem to have been somewhat wider than those of his adversary. Apart from the customary grammars and editions, we find an *oratio* to the schoolboys of Zwolle and a commentary on Peter of Spain's *Logic*.<sup>31</sup> His two volumes of poetry have to be passed over here, since the Prussian State Library still mourns this collection as 'Kriegsverlust'.<sup>32</sup> For our theme the panegyrics composed by Listrius on the occasion of Philip of Burgundy's election as bishop of Utrecht are most important. These *Silvulae duae* can be typified as a combination of a mirror of princes and a series of *descriptiones*

<sup>27</sup> *Epigrammata paranaetica* (Deventer, Albert Paffraet, 1517), NK. no.3558. See on the affair: Reichling, *Murellius* (as in n.2) 123-126; M.E. Kronenberg, "Heeft Listrius schuld aan de dood van Murellius?", *Bijdragen voor vaderlandsche geschiedenis en oudheidkunde* 6 (1930) 177-214.

<sup>28</sup> Deventer, Jacobus de Breda, c.1517, NK no.3504.

<sup>29</sup> See on this work: G. Hess, "Kommentarstruktur und Leser. Das 'Lob der Torheit' des Erasmus von Rotterdam, kommentiert von Gerardus Listrius und Sebastian Franck", in: A. Buck (ed.), *Das Kommentar in der Renaissance* (Boppard 1975) 141-165; J. Austin Gavin, Th.M. Walsh, "The Praise of Folly in Context: The commentary of Girardus Listrius", *Renaissance Quarterly* 24 (1971) 193-209.

<sup>30</sup> For his work as a teacher at Zwolle, see Frederiks, *Zwolse schoolwezen* (as in n.4) 122-124. On the dispute with the Dominicans: B.J. Spruyt, "Listrius lutherizans: His *Epistola theologica adversus Dominicanos Svollenses* (1520)", *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991) 727-751.

<sup>31</sup> *Oratio habita in coetu scholasticorum Svollensium* (Zwolle, Lubbert Rensinck, 1516?), NK no.3411. On this work: M.E. Kronenberg, "Een kostbare aanwinst voor de bibliotheek", *Verslaagen en mededeelingen van de Vereeniging tot beoefening van Overijsselsch Regt en Geschiedenis* 48, 2e reeks, 24e stuk (Deventer 1931) 33-36; *Commentarioli in dialecticen Petri Hispani* (Zwolle, Simon Corver, c.1520), NK no.1375. On this work: P. Mack, "Valla's Dialectic in the North. A commentary on Peter of Spain by Gerardus Listrius", *Vivarium* 21 (1983) 58-72.

<sup>32</sup> *Elegiae* II (Zwolle, Simon Corver, c.1520), NK no.3405 and *Elegiae* III (Deventer, Theodericus de Borne, c.1517), NK no.3406.

*urbium*.<sup>33</sup> The poet portrays the diocese of Utrecht, which is known for its famous towns. The new bishop is extensively compared with his father, Philip the Good, and their joint namesake Philip of Macedonia. The reader is reminded how peaceful and flourishing the lands of the Belgians and the Batavians were in the times of Philip the Good. Since then, quarrels, epidemics and hunger have been rampant. Now however, thanks to the new bishop, this misfortune is to come to an end. Listrius labels bishop Philip a mature man with a good education and much experience in both administration and warfare; as a result, everything can only change for the better. In this poem a good prince is conceived of as being a necessary precondition for a prosperous country. In the case of the Netherlands this can only be realised by uniting the different territories, after they have terminated their mutual battles. The more important towns of the Utrecht diocese each receive a few complimentary lines. In the case of the city of Groningen, these turn into heavy reprimands and warnings, as this city had played a very negative role: she had stood up to the episcopal/Hapsburg authority. Fortunately, in the end even the Frisians had given in and surrendered. In the numerous verses of these elegies peace and unanimity seem to be the magical words. The moral of Listrius's poems may be described as follows: unite the fertile Belgian lands, in order that they may again enjoy peace and good fortune.

So far four prominent Dutch humanist teachers have been discussed briefly, and it is clear that on the whole they concerned themselves almost exclusively with actual teaching and the provision of teaching instruments. Other activities were nothing more than a side line. In modern studies, humanism and teaching are usually mentioned in one breath, and this can be explained by the fact that instruction was one of the essential elements of humanism. When it came to trying to convince the world that their particular train of thought was superior, humanists literally formed a movement. Such a co-operation was necessary, for in the anti-modernist society of those days, it was crucial to stress the intellectual pedigree, to

---

<sup>33</sup> *Duae silvulae in honorem Philippi Episcopi Trajectini*, in: Gerardus Geldenhauer, *Germanicarum historiarum illustratio* (Marburg 1542) 83-106, esp. the second poem *Alteri Listrii Sylvula in eiusdem praeconium*. Cf. J. Sterk, *Philips van Bourgondië, 1465-1524, bisschop van Utrecht als protagonist van de Renaissance; zijn leven en maecenaat* (Zutphen 1980) 36.



give testimonies of excellence and to underline the practicality and applicability of the novel model of culture propagated by the humanists. The rhetoric of the latter, as witnessed in the many *In osores studiorum humanitatis* (a popular genre, practised by each of the humanists discussed), was a means to render change acceptable, and in doing this humanists were highly successful.

Thus it happened that after 1500 clerical and secular authorities grew more and more convinced of the necessity of reform in a humanistic sense. The subsequent educational revolution resulted from the great efforts that humanistic pedagogism—such as that examined in this paper—instilled into the youth of the Low Countries. As this type of learning was assumed to offer a rounded preparation for civic life, it opened the way to a number of careers. Thanks to training in both *eloquentia* and *sapientia*, potential servants of the urban communities, the church and the state, acquired professional self-confidence, and they consequently felt that they had a moral right as well as a vocational need to interfere in the social state of affairs.<sup>34</sup>

In general, humble teachers did not yet aim so high. It was they, however, who in the formal centres of learning, *in casu* the schools, trained the future flower of the nation. By doing that, however, pedagogues exerted an enormous informal influence, because, through their teaching, they consciously sought to better society. In principle, the work these schoolmasters produced in their spare time, exhibits the same intentions, as has been indicated in this paper. Considering the modest amount of so-called ‘external’ writings, it is true however, that the formal training offered was a much greater success than the informal way of ventilating ideas which, without any obligation, could be, or not, picked up according to liking. It seems thus proper to conclude with a programmatic *repetitio*, that once flowed from Johannes Murmellius’s pen. By way of reciting appropriate hymns, the schoolboys learned the right civic attitudes and the goals for which to strive. With this in mind, rector Murmellius composed a school hymn on St Martin of Tours, who is both the patron saint of Groningen as well as of the whole diocese of Utrecht. The hymn has the following chorus:

---

<sup>34</sup> For a general survey of these developments, which is also valid for the Netherlands, see A. Grafton and L. Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities. Education and Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-century Europe* (London 1987).

*De Hollandia distichon*

*Divitiis, fama, populis Hollandia floret  
Moribus, ingeniis, arte, nitore, fide.*

(A distichon on Holland. Holland flourishes in riches, fame, inhabitants, morals, talent, art, splendour, faith).<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> *De Martini Turonensis episc. vita* (Deventer, Albert Paffraet, 1513), NK no.1581; cf. Burger, *Een Monument* (as in n.20) 41-43.



## LATIN LITERATURE IN EARLY MODERN GRONINGEN\*

F. AKKERMAN

In this volume of papers, read at the conference on 'Centres of Learning' held at the University of Groningen, it seems appropriate to devote some attention to the intellectual history of the city and its region. Groningen has been a regional centre of schooling and learning for more than five centuries. The University was founded in 1614, but the beginning of Groningen's position as a centre of higher education goes much further back. The second half of the fifteenth century has title to such a claim. Thus a long period of a century and a half precedes the institution of the 'Academia'.<sup>1</sup> Several forms of intellectual life can be observed during these years, most of which are closely bound up with schooling and education. I have thought it appropriate to contribute a few pages on this period to the transactions of the congress; even if this forces me to note some facts and considerations I have published on other occasions.<sup>2</sup>

Our dates can be delineated more precisely. The period at issue is clearly connected with the renewed interest in the authors of classical

---

\* For his kind help with the English of this article I wish to thank my colleague A.J. Vanderjagt.

<sup>1</sup> In the charter of foundation the governors of the city and province of Groningen referred to king Alphons of Aragon and his humanist academy of Naples as their model. Cf. F. Akkerman, "Onderwijs en geleerdheid in Groningen tussen 1469 en 1614", and A.J. Vanderjagt, "Filosofie tussen humanisme en eclecticisme. Van Ubbo Emmius (1547-1625) tot Martinus Schoock (1614-1669)", in: G.A. van Gemert, J. Schuller tot Peursum-Meijer, A.J. Vanderjagt (eds.), *'Om niet aan onwetendheid en barbarij te bezwijken'. Groningse geleerden 1614-1989* (Hilversum 1989) 13-29 and 31-49.

<sup>2</sup> F. Akkerman, "Agricola and Groningen. A humanist on his origin", in: F. Akkerman, A.J. Vanderjagt (eds.), *Rodolphus Agricola Phrisius (1444-1485). Proceedings of the International Conference at the University of Groningen 28-30 October 1985* (Leiden 1988) 3-20; F. Akkerman, "Early humanism in Groningen", in: Z.R.W.M. von Martels (ed.), *Alchemy Revisited. Proceedings of the International Conference on the History of Alchemy at the University of Groningen 17-19 April 1989* (Leiden 1990) 89-97; F. Akkerman, "Rudolf Agricola und der Humanismus im friesischen Raum", in: *Rudolf Agricola (1444-1485), der Protagonist des nordeuropäischen Humanismus. Studien und Editionen zum Gedenken an seinen 550. Geburtstag*, hrsg. von Wilhelm Kühnmann (Bern 1994), 49-66.

antiquity and with the active and passive cultivation of the Greek and Latin languages, generally associated with the *studia humanitatis*. In studies on this northern humanism<sup>3</sup> it has become customary to demarcate the period of humanism in Groningen and the surrounding region with the dates 1469 and 1625. From the first of these two years, the earliest humanist or Neo-Latin letters have come down to us, while the second date is significant because it marks the death of Ubbo Emmius, the first rector of the University, and it seems that around that time a new phase was beginning in the intellectual history of Groningen—also in the uses of Latin. In these 156 years four personalities can be discerned of outstanding intellectual stature, each of whom in his own field of interests and activities dominated his peers.

The first of these men is Rudolph Agricola (1444-1485),<sup>4</sup> who is now recognised as one of the founding fathers of humanism north of the Alps. His highly original *De inventione dialectica* inaugurated a new era in the teaching of dialectic and rhetoric, and he himself was one of the first scholars outside Italy to master Greek. Further, he greatly stimulated the new kind of intellectual life in the North in several directions, not least through his many national and international personal contacts and friendships and through his letter writing. For a short time (1479/80-1484) Agricola was involved heavily in the social and political life of the town and the province during his tenure as a secretary of the town government. He was born in the small village of Baflo, not far from the North Sea, and he died at the court of Johann von Dalberg, the bishop of Worms, in Heidelberg.

Wessel Gansfort (1414-1489),<sup>5</sup> the second luminary of Groningen, has won the reputation of being a most important representative of late-medieval theological and philosophical thought. His devotional writings—for example his *Scala meditationis*—still make an impression on the modern reader through their passionate style and feeling. It is said that his critical attitude towards theology and ecclesiastical practice earned him the title *magister contradictionis*; a later

---

<sup>3</sup> I mean those by Vanderjagt, *Filosofie tussen humanisme en eclecticisme* (as in n.1) 44, and by myself *Onderwijs en geleerdheid* (as in n.1) 20-21.

<sup>4</sup> On Agricola, see the books cited in n.2 (with bibliographies).

<sup>5</sup> On Gansfort, see F. Akkerman, G.C. Huisman, A.J. Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort (1419-1489) and Northern Humanism* (Leiden 1993) (with bibliography).

generation eulogised him on the title page of his books as *lux mundi*. Born in the town of Groningen, he wandered between the intellectual centres of Europe but died in his own hometown as the priest of a nunnery.

It is of interest to note that whereas Erasmus praised and admired Agricola as his forerunner, it was Luther who saw in Wessel Gansfort a prophet who had a divine calling like that of himself.<sup>6</sup>

Our third humanist is Regnerus Praedinius (1510-1559).<sup>7</sup> For thirty years his inspired rectorate of the Latin school connected with St Martin's Church at Groningen drew large numbers of pupils from far and near, thus eclipsing the famous schools of the IJssel towns Zwolle and Deventer. Praedinius had great influence in forming an elite of men who were to embrace Calvinism in the next generation. In his theological writings he testifies to a religious attitude that gradually develops from Erasmian humanism to Calvinism. Praedinius admired Agricola and venerated Gansfort. He was born in the village of Winsum and died in the town of Groningen.

Ubbo Emmius (1547-1625)<sup>8</sup> was born in the East-Frisian village of Greetsiel on the east side of the Dollard. After his education and studies at Emden, Bremen, Norden, Rostock and Geneva, he came to Groningen in 1594 as the rector of Praedinius's school and in 1614 he became the first rector of the University. His greatest fame as a scholar rests on his work on the history of Frisia, which he freed from chauvinistic legend and placed upon a solid base of documentary evidence. Besides history, he also practised the arts of letter writing, chronology and biography; there survive a few poems from his hand, and there is his own school programme. Emmius was the last accomplished humanist of Groningen.

It is striking that practically the whole of the literary production of the humanist period in Groningen is in Latin. This pertains not only to the works of these giants but also to the writings of lesser

---

<sup>6</sup> On Gansfort and Luther, see C. Augustijn "Wessel Gansfort's rise to celebrity", in: Akkerman, Huisman, Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort* (as in n.5) 15.

<sup>7</sup> Recent on Praedinius: F. Postma, "Regnerus Praedinius (ca. 1510-1559), seine Schule und sein Einfluss", in: Akkerman, Huisman, Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort* (as in n.5) 290-324.

<sup>8</sup> For recent work on Emmius, see the contributions of J. Ensink and J.A.R. Kemper in: Akkerman, Huisman, Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort* (as in n.5) 210-244, 245-266; W.J. Koppers (ed.), *Ubbo Emmius. Een Oostfries geleerde in Groningen/Ubbo Emmius. Ein Ostfriesischer Gelehrter in Groningen* (Groningen/Emden 1994).

figures and also to a number of other documents. In the scholarly work of the past this fact has mostly either been taken for granted or ignored altogether, thus causing some grave misrepresentations of the intellectual side of Groningen's history. While it is true that letter writing in the vernacular established itself during the sixteenth century, and that there are also some historical chronicles in local forms of Dutch or Low German, neither of these was the starting point of an important literature in the mother tongue. Unlike the Latin writings of the humanists, these vernacular contributions were not meant to be displayed as public manifestations of culture.

What is true for Italy—'that humanism was first and foremost a renewal of Latin and the whole cultural life connected with Latin', as IJsewijn has said<sup>9</sup>—holds good also for Groningen. By the formula 'Latin literature' in the title of this paper I mean that exclusive cultivation of Latin literary forms and contents which is the core and substance of early humanism. The latter is by no means everywhere in Europe north of the Alps as strong and as early as in the Groningen region. Already in the third quarter of the fifteenth century there existed a group of men in the northeastern Netherlands who were active in various ways as teachers, poets, letterwriters, or who were in other ways stimulated to take part in the humanist movement and its programme. If we compare the Groningen scene with the situation elsewhere, this state of affairs is quite remarkable. In towns like Bremen and Hamburg, Emden, Strasbourg and Basle and the Alsace, Heidelberg, Nürnberg and Erfurt, Louvain and Antwerp the production of Neo-Latin begins later, or only with some singular individual, or on a lower level, or all of this together. In Groningen the Latin language was not suddenly introduced to treat subjects of a humanist or non-humanist nature that were already being treated in the vernacular.<sup>10</sup> Rather, it was introduced on a very high level, in close connection with Italian humanism and with classical Latin

---

<sup>9</sup> J. IJsewijn, "The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries", in: H.A. Oberman, T.A. Brady Jr. (eds.), *Itinerarium Italicum, The Profile of Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations*, dedicated to Paul Oskar Kristeller (Leiden 1975) 195.

<sup>10</sup> The oldest letters in the Amerbach correspondence of 1481 and following years, treating of impersonal, businesslike matters, are written in a rude Latin style (e.g. by Adolph Rusch) or in German. The first one composed in elegant Neo-Latin is from the hand of Jacob Wimpfeling (1450-1528) and bears the date May 4th, 1494 (*Die Amerbachkorrespondenz*, Basel Univ. Bib. Bnd 1, 1942).

and even Greek literature, in order to express thoughts and ideas that lay at the very heart of humanism. In the course of the next century and a half the forms of thought, feeling, reasoning, narration and the writing of poetry, are more and more taken over from and adapted to classical standards. This phenomenon is complex and it demands much philological, linguistic and rhetorical study before a fully adequate picture of it may be obtained. In the following I shall only touch upon a few aspects hereof, and mention a small selection of texts and personalities to illustrate the foregoing.

From the initial period, the years 1469-1475, we possess nineteen prose letters by three authors: Rudolph von Langen (c.1438-1519), Rudolph Agricola and Antonius Liber (d.1508). All are written in a clear and pure Latin remarkably free from medievalisms. They are mostly on humanist topics like style, grammar, rhetoric, the art of letter writing, friendship, the barbarous culture of the North in comparison with that of Italy, or on other 'modern' moral or literary subjects. Already in the very first of these letters mention is made of the *Elegantiolae* by the Italian Agostino Dati, which enormously influenced the quality of Latin in Europe. There are more than a hundred printings of this text before 1500, the first dating from about 1470; but in Groningen it is already mentioned and use is made of it as a standard for good Latin in 1469. This means that it must have circulated by then in manuscript form among the members of the so-called Adwert Academy.<sup>11</sup> Language, style and grammar are obviously extremely important in the whole humanist period, but it is not the only thing that counts. In the only six letters by Von Langen that have been preserved from these years there are quotations from or references to Cicero, Jerome, Vergil, Plautus, Terence, Livy, Sallust, Ovid, Aulus Gellius, Seneca, Quintilian, Ulpian, Curtius Rufus, Plutarch, Augustine, Leonardo Bruni, Plato, Aristotle, Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Cyprian, Agostino Dati: twenty-two authors in all.

Another early humanist, Antonius Liber, composed a huge volume of Latin letters—not less than 348 in number—by five authors

---

<sup>11</sup> The "Adwert Academy" represents a heterogenous group of layman and clerics who now and then came together for quite a while in the monastery of Aduard near Groningen, in order to read and talk to each other; the first testimony is of 1469; the discussions must have gone on till the end of the century. See P.S. Allen, *The Age of Erasmus* (Oxford 1914), ch. II, and the articles cited in n.2.



from Antiquity, two from the Middle Ages and thirteen modern Italian and Northern humanists. What is even more amazing is that this book was printed as early as about 1475 at Cologne. It was dedicated to Arnold von Hildesheim, a friend of Agricola; the latter was at that time the headmaster of the St Martin's school at Groningen, and the book was apparently meant for his lessons. So far, no other letter collection of the same scope and intellectual level has been found anywhere else in Europe for this period, either in manuscript or in print.<sup>12</sup>

A third illustration of the Latinity of this period is Agricola himself. For the years '69-'75 we have six letters from his hand, and from the remaining ten years of his life there are a further forty-four. It is striking to see how quickly his style developed from an experimental stage to a fully adequate way of personally expressing his own world of experience. I mention only the long letter of 1 November 1482 to his friend Jacobus Barbirianus, written from Cologne, while Agricola is on his return journey from Heidelberg to Groningen. He finds himself in a delicate position: several of his friends entreat him to come and take up permanent residence at their homes. In a splendid, very complex letter of some 1300 words he now sets about explaining his conflicting feelings. A year later this letter was printed by John of Westphalia in Louvain, together with a few other letters, some poems and a translation from Greek into Latin. Three years earlier Agricola had written his handbook *De inventione dialectica*, which had no other purpose than adapting the Latin language to personal and public discourse. The book only found its way to a general public much later, but his intimate friends from the North, among them Alexander Hegius (c.1439-1498)<sup>13</sup>, immediately took a keen interest in it. In his time and among his fellow humanists Agricola was *facile princeps*, but still it was to them that he addressed himself in most of his writings.

A word or two should be said on poetry, often enough ignored by historians—to their own detriment, for there is hardly a humanist text in which poetry does not figure. It should not be forgotten that

---

<sup>12</sup> Mr. Adrie van der Laan in Groningen, who has kindly allowed me to make use of his findings, is engaged in a study of the volume.

<sup>13</sup> Hegius, who participated in the Aduard group, was headmaster of the Lebuinus-school in Deventer (1482-1498). Erasmus praised him in his Adage "Quid cani et balneo" (*Ad.* 339 in ASD II-1, 438-442).

for three or four centuries the writing of Latin verse was a regular subject in Latin schools all over Europe. The early period of northern humanism has no Dante or Petrarch to offer, but there are collections of poetry by Rudolph von Langen, Rudolph Agricola, Bartholomeus Coloniensis, Frederick Mormann, Alexander Hegius, Judocus Besselius and one or more poems by Antonius Liber, Bernard van Doesborch and Paulus Pelantinus. In a period when hardly any Neo-Latin poetry was yet being printed in Italy, poetry appeared in print by Agricola (1483 and 1484), by Von Langen (1486), Bartholomeus Coloniensis (1491), Judocus Besselius (1493), Alexander Hegius (1503). Besselius lived in Antwerp, but through his close friendship with Agricola, especially evident in writing verse together, he almost belongs to the northern circle of humanists. Eighteen poems, chiefly by Frederick Mormann, have been recently edited with a full commentary.<sup>14</sup> The originality and erudition of these poems can now be seen clearly, for Schoonbeeg has carefully studied their poetic idiom, their themes and their technique in relation to classical and contemporary models. Mormann appears to have had a thorough knowledge of the classical poets, including those of the Christian era. The last two poems in the collection are about the return of Agricola from Italy to Groningen. One of these is a festive *carmen* in asclepiadean stanzas addressed to Wessel Gansfort. Agricola is said to be on his way back home with the explicit purpose of meeting Gansfort and enjoying their talk together:

*Hic, Wessele, petet te duce Apolline  
optans ante tuo colloquio frui.*

These verses, incidentally, contain a fine classical reminiscence—to wit, of Vergil, *Aeneid* 5.840:

*te, Palinure, petens, tibi somnia tristia portans  
insoniti.*

As Mormann had hoped and foretold, Wessel and Agricola were indeed to become friends and conversation partners in the years 1480-1484. This partnership of Agricola and Wessel—the true-to-type humanist of Italian stamp and the devotional theologian and nominalist philosopher—may well puzzle or even confound us.

---

<sup>14</sup> P. Schoonbeeg, ‘Friderici Mauri carmina. An edition with commentary, with an introduction by C.G. Santing’, in: Akkerman, Huisman, Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort* (as in n.5) 325-386. Dr. Santing had recognised these poems in a Munich manuscript.

Modern scholars tend to stress their differences, perhaps in order to strengthen their own definitions of humanism and medieval philosophy and theology. A critical edition of some seven pages from Wessel's *Scala meditationis* has recently been edited,<sup>15</sup> so that the reader will be able to see for himself what splendid texts Wessel has left us; it remains a task for the future to edit and translate these texts, which are written in a rather difficult Latin.

A very different intellectual note is struck by the fictitious and purely pagan literary dialogue about the choice between town and country-life by Jacob Canter (c.1491), son of a lawyer in Groningen, who is reputed to have conversed exclusively in Latin with his household.<sup>16</sup>

The work of Gansfort and Agricola is an exceptionally high point in the intellectual life of Groningen, and it continued to exert its influence in the next century and a half, even though there is little to show for this in the sense of a broad stream of varied literary publications. The two masts of northern intellectuality, Agricola's Italianising humanism and Gansfort's devotional theology and philosophy, were not supported without a mainstay from outside. This was Erasmus of Rotterdam, who managed to combine humanism with theology in a blend that found a ready acceptance in Groningen and that set the trend for the sixteenth century in the way of Latin style and theological debate.

It should be stressed that the course Groningen was to take on its way to the Reformation in the second half of the sixteenth century, was determined to a large degree by a small, intellectual, strongly latinised elite, formed in the last decades of the fifteenth century. Religious debate in this period (at least those specimens that have been preserved) and which, without doubt, determined the direction of things, was conducted largely in Latin. Goswinus van Halen (c.1468-1530),<sup>17</sup> a pupil of Agricola, Gansfort and Hegius, wrote in

---

<sup>15</sup> K. Enenkel, "Wessel Gansforts Stellungnahme zum *vita activa-vita contemplativa*-Problem", in: Akkerman, Huisman, Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort* (as in n.5). The text of Wessel in an appendix (57-70).

<sup>16</sup> Jacobus Canter, *Dialogus de solitudine* (c.1491), edited with an introduction, translation and notes by Bunna Ebels-Hoving (Munich 1981).

<sup>17</sup> Goswinus was rector of the House of the Brethren of the Common life in Groningen from 1497(?) till his death in 1530. He wrote letters and dialogues which are lost; only a *vita* of Rudolph Agricola, a fragment of a *vita* of Gansfort and (fragments of) three letters to Hardenberg survive.

Latin, and in his turn taught Latin to his pupils, of whom the best known are Albert Hardenberg (1510-1574)<sup>18</sup> and Regnerus Praedinius, who both sympathised with ideas of theological and ecclesiastical reform. The well-known and well-studied religious debate of 1523 between the Black Friars of the town and the clergy of St Martin's church, known as the *Disputatio Groningensis*,<sup>19</sup> was attended by a large crowd consisting of men *omnis ordinis omnis conditionis*, who had been invited by the Dominicans. The disputation was held in Latin and is essentially an intellectual joust of the common academic type. The tenor of its contents is clearly and radically reform-minded.<sup>20</sup> Here, at a very early date, are the leading men of the main church of Groningen. These men were also closely connected to the town administration and to the Latin school, whose headmaster, Nicolaus Lesdorpheus, took part in the debate, turning into the direction of reform. These Groningen reformers, however, did not wish to destroy their opponents, but to coax them along in their own direction. Elsewhere in the Netherlands, there was a great deal more radicalism in the reform movement; there were clear breaks, many reversals, and even downright killings. But the cautious policy of Groningen in the first quarter of the sixteenth century was adhered to strictly in the next generation as well. A clear example is that of Regnerus Praedinius, the headmaster of the Latin school from 1529 till 1559. He started as an Erasmian humanist with a strong sympathy for religious reform, but at the end of his life he had almost become a Calvinist.<sup>21</sup>

The Latin of these people is a good gauge for their whole stand in religious matters. The situation in the neighbouring town, Zwolle, to the south, on the IJssel River, offers excellent material for a comparison. The scene at Zwolle was dominated by the accomplished Erasmian humanist Gerard Listrius (1485/90—*post* 1522).<sup>22</sup> He

---

<sup>18</sup> On Hardenberg, see W. Janse, *Albert Hardenberg als Theologe, Profil eines Bucer-Schülers* († 1574) (Leiden 1994).

<sup>19</sup> See S.P. Wolfs O.P., *Das Groninger "Religionsgespräch" (1523) und seine Hintergründe* (Utrecht/Nijmegen 1959).

<sup>20</sup> In 1523 "reform" does not necessarily mean "Reformation".

<sup>21</sup> See Postma, *Regnerus Praedinius* (as in n.7).

<sup>22</sup> On Listrius, see B.J. Spruyt, "Listrius lutherizans: His *Epistola theologica adversus Dominicanos Suollenses* (1520)", *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 22.4 (1991) 727-751; C.G. van Leijenhorst, "Gerardus Listrius", in: *Contemporaries of Erasmus*, vol.2 (Toronto 1986) 335-336.

wrote excellent Neo-Latin, and in a few years time had developed into a confirmed believer in Luther's dogmas. He was the advisor of the printer of heretical books in the same town, Simon Corver;<sup>23</sup> besides, he was the declared and bitter enemy of the Dominicans there. Thus he seems, too, to have been a source of unrest and a nuisance to the town fathers, and probably to the duke of Gueldres as well. He therefore lost his cause at Zwolle, and disappeared abruptly, as did the printer Corver. The Latin of the *Disputatio Groningensis*—incidentally, printed by Corver at Zwolle in the very year of the disputation in Groningen—is not as advanced and is also less pure than that of Listrius. There is in it no lack of the usual theological jargon of academically trained theologians; nevertheless it has a strong Erasmian undertone, which here and there comes to dominate the text. It is clear that these clerics were connected with the town administrators, and that their adversaries were not their enemies. It is also of importance that there was no printer at Groningen—nor was there to be until the end of the century. Although there is no documentary evidence, it would seem to have been the conscious and cautious city policy to keep printers, who were often sources of unrest in towns and cities during the Reformation period, out of Groningen. Certainly during the sixteenth century, with the rapidly rising fame of the Latin school, there would otherwise have been every good reason for a printer to settle there. Yet, the town fathers, who clearly backed the hidden or even open dissemination of the ideas of the Reformation by the schools, could not tolerate the additional dangers of a printing house. They had always to be on their guard against interventions from their overlords, first the duke of Guelders and later the court at Brussels. Soon after these dangers were over a printer did set up his press at Groningen.<sup>24</sup>

Another item that is worth attention is the writing of Latin letters by people from Groningen in the sixteenth century. A prime example is the large Van Ewsum collection of correspondence. The Latin parts of it are now being studied at the University of Groningen.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> On Simon Corver and Listrius, cf. C. Augustijn, *Wessel Gansfort's rise* (as in n.6) 3-10.

<sup>24</sup> His name was Alle Pietersz, the date 1598. See Jos M.M. Hermans, *Boeken in Groningen voor 1600. Studies rond de librije van de Sint-Maarten* (Groningen 1987) 79.

<sup>25</sup> See A.H. van der Laan, Y. Kuik, "*Raptim et ebrie satis*. Neo-Latin letters from the Van Ewsum-archives in Groningen", in: Akkerman, Huisman, Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort* (as in n.5) 267-272.

From these pieces it becomes clear that many of the leading people in the province of Groningen had studied at Louvain or elsewhere, and that they were sometimes excellent Latinists. They were supported and stimulated in their studies by Johannes van Ewsum (d. 1570), one of the leading noblemen of the Ommelanden (the area round the city). It was not only future lawyers, priests or parsons and doctors who learned Latin thoroughly here; farmers, too, often studied Latin and in some cases Greek as well, at least long and hard enough to be able later to participate in public life at a high intellectual level. A good example is the leading East-Frisian farmer Hero Boyen, of whom ten letters to Ubbo Emmius have been preserved.<sup>26</sup>

A final word must be devoted to Latin historiography. The first during the humanist period to treat an historical subject in Latin is Wilhelmus Frederici (c. 1455-1525). The title of the book that he wrote in 1499 on the history of Frisia easily betrays its humanist inspiration: *De Frisiorum situ, origine, moribus, rebus gestis et viris illustribus*.<sup>27</sup> It was not printed at the time and its Latin is very poor, sometimes almost incomprehensible. Frederici, who was the leading man in Groningen politically, ecclesiastically and also intellectually for forty years or more, had a great admiration for Agricola, but even though he studied in Italy for many years and took two doctoral degrees there, he could never match the brilliance of his compatriot. Still, it must not be forgotten that his text marks the beginning of what is probably the most difficult thing that humanists had to master in Neo-Latin: the art of telling the complex reality of history. Frederici predates Ubbo Emmius, the great Latin historiographer of Frisia, by a century, and in the intervening time the art of narration in writing concerning the history of Frisia had made great strides forward. Northern Latin chroniclers, starting with Frederici, and continuing with Worp van Thabor, Cornelius Kempius and Suffridus Petrus wrestled with Latin to reach a good, readable historical style. Even before Emmius, this was attained fully, in the chronicle by Eggerik Egges Phebens, who summarised the first thirty years of

---

<sup>26</sup> See J. Ensink, "Ex fideli in patriam zelo. Hero Boyen, East-Frisian farmer and politician, c. 1550-c. 1620", in: Akkerman, Huisman, Vanderjagt (eds.), *Wessel Gansfort* (as in n. 5) 210-244.

<sup>27</sup> On Frederici, see W. Zuidema, *Wilhelmus Frederici, persona van Sint-Maarten te Groningen (1489-1525) en de Groninger staatkunde van zijn tijd* (Groningen 1881).

the Eighty Years War against Spain in Groningen.<sup>28</sup> Strongly influenced by Sallust and perhaps also by Caesar, Phebens succeeded where most of his predecessors had failed: he wrote a fluent, concise and at times even a brilliant Latin. This is especially clear in the preface to his chronicle, which in ten pages epitomises masterfully the entire character of the war as it had been fought in the province. This piece of prose is unmatched in sixteenth century Latin historiography in the Netherlands.

Groningen never was an intellectual centre like Alexandria, Baghdad, Padua or Paris, but its importance far exceeds the regional, provincial atmosphere of a somewhat off-centre city in Europe. Most of all: the essence of its early-modern intellectual history is Latin.

---

<sup>28</sup> *Eggerici Eggaei Phebens Chronicon Rerum in Phrisia et praecipue circa Groningam gestarum*, Werken van het Historisch Genootschap, nieuwe serie no.7, ed. by H.O. Feith (Utrecht 1867). In an undergraduate thesis Mrs. Dynke van der Wijk has studied this text (Groningen 1990, not published).